



THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 4.—OCTOBER—1917.

I.

RECOLLECTIONS OF DR. HARBAUGH.

J. SPANGLER KIEFFER.

My recollections of Dr. Harbaugh begin almost with my earliest childhood. When he came to his first charge at Lewisburg, Pa., in December, 1843, I was a child, between one and two years old, in my father's house at Mifflinburg, ten miles distant. Before he left Lewisburg and removed to Lancaster, Pa., in 1850, I was of a sufficient age to remember occasions on which he came to Mifflinburg and was a guest in my father's family. Also, between the time of his removal to Lancaster and my going to college in 1857, I remember one or two visits paid by him to my father. Such visits were perhaps occasioned in part by the circumstance that Dr. Harbaugh's second wife, whom he married in Lewisburg, the daughter of Fleming Linn, Esq., was a cousin of my father's second wife, who was the daughter of Mr. David Linn. They were due, also in part, to the fact that, in those days, it was the custom of neighboring ministers to render assistance to each other on special occasions, particularly in seasons of what were known as "protracted meetings." Ministers were then in the habit of holding, in the course of the winter, meetings of a more or less evangelistic character, in which they would assist each other.

In later years, I remember to have heard Dr. Harbaugh speak of my father's having assisted him in such a meeting. It was probably on some such occasion that the young Lewisburg pastor first came to the assistance of my father. At all events, one of my earliest recollections of him is that of a sermon preached by him from the text, "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord; curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

To me, in those days, regarding Mr. Harbaugh with a boy's characteristic remoteness, demureness and silence (for in those days children were mostly silent—they were taught that children were "to be seen and not heard," and to "speak only when spoken to") he was a very interesting and impressive personality. This was, first, because, as a minister of the Gospel, he was, in a remarkable degree, what it might be supposed that a minister ought to be. In many of the ministers of that day, as I recall them, there was something peculiarly impressive. Their dress was ministerial; they were dignified in their bearing; they gave one an idea of their office, as something apart, special, unusual, and to be regarded with a sort of reverence. They were not men of learning; their education had for the most part necessarily been very imperfect; but in other and more vitally important respects they were not deficient; and they certainly gave one an idea of the dignity and importance of the ministerial office. Even then, indeed, there were those to whom it seemed that the dignity of the office and the people's respect and reverence for it were things which had in large measure passed away. I remember hearing my father speak of the peculiar feeling of reverence with which, as a boy, he had regarded the Rev. Dr. Lewis Mayer, who had been the pastor of his parents at Shepherdstown, Va. To him, even in those days, it seemed that the old reverence for the office of the ministry was gone. To me, however, perhaps because I was a child, much of it seemed still to remain. The ministers who came to my father's house

were for the most part persons of great dignity, whom I was accustomed to regard from a distance, with feelings of reverence. This was particularly true of my father's most intimate friend, the Rev. Peter S. Fisher, of Boalsburg, Pa., and of the Rev. Richard A. Fisher, of Sunbury, Pa., who sometimes visited my father, and who were fine examples of the old-fashioned minister. It was true, also, even in the days of his young manhood, of Dr. Harbaugh. Then, as afterwards, he always impressed me (though I would not then have so expressed it) as an ambassador of some great king. He was pleasant, genial, kindly, but always dignified; always he was the minister. There was a peculiar deliberateness and impressiveness in his preaching; one characteristic of it was, great reserve of power; he always spoke as one who was putting forth only a part of his strength, as one who had at his command great reserves of power, which he might, if necessary, at any moment call into action. His preaching reminded one of Ruskin's words: "Is not the evidence of Ease on the very front of all the greatest works in existence? Do they not say plainly to us, not 'there has been a great effort here,' but 'there has been a great power here'?" It was a thing, not of effort, but of power; of power wisely put forth, now more, now less, as the case might require. His words were words of weight; he himself was a man of weight and strength, physically, intellectually, morally. He would have satisfied the requirements of Dr. Chalmers, whose first question in regard to any new man is said to have been, "Is he a mon o' wecht?"

The thing, however, which in those days most interested and impressed me was the circumstance of his being an author. He was the first person ever seen by me who had written a book; and to me, in the humble and secluded life I was living, the writer of a book was a great and extraordinary being. Already at Lewisburg, Dr. Harbaugh began that literary activity, to which, as it were, he was impelled by his very nature, and which he continued throughout his entire life. It was at Lewisburg that he began writing his books on Heaven,

The Sainted Dead, The Heavenly Recognition, The Heavenly Home. Afterwards, turning to subjects relating to the history of the Reformed Church, he wrote *The Life of Michael Schlatter, The Fathers of the Reformed Church*, etc. These books, as they appeared, came regularly to my father's house, and the seeing and reading of them invested the author of them, to my mind, with a special interest and importance. I was most influenced, however, in those days, not so much by any book written by him, as by a periodical which he established and edited. It was while he was still at Lewisburg, it was in January, 1850, that he founded the magazine entitled *The Guardian*, a periodical which he edited for many years, and which afterwards, for some years, was edited by others. I remember well the first appearance of *The Guardian*. I recall its title-page, with the angels blowing their trumpets, and the printed message of each one. The appearance of this periodical in a house in which at that time no other magazine of the kind was known, was an important event in my life, and no doubt in the lives of many others who were then children. *The Guardian*, in its day, exercised an important and beneficent influence, especially in begetting and cultivating in its readers the love of literature. There are some of us to-day who probably owe much of their interest in literature to the reading of *The Guardian* in their youth. The articles of Dr. Harbaugh himself, which always had a peculiar and characteristic quality of their own, were always read with interest, and produced a deep impression. One of the most interesting features of *The Guardian*, in those early days, was a series of letters, under the title of "My Pilgrim's Pouch," written in description of his travels in foreign lands by the Rev. Benjamin Bausman, Dr. Harbaugh's successor in the church at Lewisburg. These were the first letters from abroad ever read by me; and they were read with great avidity. I remember especially the account given of the traveller's visit, in Scotland, to the birthplace of Robert Burns. I am not sure but that my first acquaintance with Burns and his poetry was

derived from this letter and the quotations from his poetry which were contained in it. That was a great hour for me when I first read, in *The Guardian*, of Robert Burns, and committed to memory some passages of his poetry there given. In like manner, though this was several years afterwards, it was through the same instrumentality that I was made acquainted with Wordsworth's immortal "Ode on Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood." Of this poem, which has been pronounced by the highest authority "the high-water-mark of English lyric poetry," Dr. Harbaugh wrote with great enthusiasm, for it evidently struck a deep chord in his own soul, and was the well-nigh perfect expression of some of his deepest thoughts and feelings. By what he wrote concerning this masterpiece, he communicated his enthusiasm to me; an enthusiasm which has never since departed from me. This was a part of the service which he rendered by means of this modest magazine; the calling of attention to, and the awakening of enthusiasm for, some of the greatest productions of literature. If, as Matthew Arnold says, culture consists in knowing the best that has been thought and said in the world, he who makes young persons acquainted with some of these best things renders a valuable service. It was Dr. Harbaugh's custom to write for *The Guardian*, in the form of a series, articles on certain subjects, some of which were afterwards published in book form. It was thus that the book entitled *Birds of the Bible* came to be published. I remember it chiefly from the circumstance that it was by means of it that I first became acquainted with Edgar Allan Poe's poem of "The Raven."

When my father took me to college, in September, 1857, being then a boy between fifteen and sixteen years of age, I was placed, in a certain sense, under the care of Dr. Harbaugh, who, since March, 1850, had been pastor of the First Reformed Church of Lancaster. I cannot say, however, that my relation to him during the three years of my college course was such as to furnish me with any interesting personal recol-

lections. I was an extraordinarily shy and diffident boy; my professors, and Dr. Harbaugh along with them, were to me as superior beings, whom I regarded at a distance, with feelings of reverence and awe, and with whom it was neither becoming nor possible that I should be on terms of familiar association. One of my chief recollections of Dr. Harbaugh is that of being instructed in the Catechism and prepared for confirmation by him. I was confirmed by him on the evening of Sunday, January 9, 1858; and one of my cherished possessions is a certificate of confirmation bearing his signature. I also sometimes attended a Bible class taught by him, as a part of the Sunday School, and consisting mostly of college students; and, along with other students, regularly attended the evening services at his church, having in the morning attended service in the College Chapel. My impressions of him, as a preacher, already given, were partly formed during these three years. There was something peculiarly impressive and persuasive in his preaching. His presence in the pulpit was one of great dignity; but it was a dignity which was winning, and not repellent; one felt the propriety, the beauty, the sweetness of it. There was nothing in him (and the presence of it, had there been, would have been in him an incongruous and offending thing) of that smartness, of that "hustling" quality, so to speak, which sometimes seems to be thought one of the necessary characteristics of a minister. I do not remember ever to have heard him preach a sermon on any of those droll and grotesque subjects which one sometimes sees announced in the newspapers, and the use of which seems to be thought necessary in order to attract hearers. He attracted hearers, and held their attention, and powerfully affected their minds and hearts, by simply preaching, with the earnestness of a great soul and a warm heart, the Word of God and the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He was genial; but it could not be said of him that he was "jolly," in that peculiar sense in which it is sometimes thought to compliment a minister by attributing to him that remarkable quality.

Dr. Harbaugh's ten years' ministry in Lancaster was not without its tribulations. Partly because of his uncompromising attitude on the question of temperance, and partly because of differences and antagonisms excited by the Liturgical Movement of that day, in which he was one of the leaders, difficulty and trouble arose in the congregation. To compose these differences, a special meeting of the Lancaster Classis was at one time called; and I remember attending, along with other students, some of the sessions of the Classis, when engaged in this painful and distressing investigation. I remember being much impressed by what was said by Dr. Harbaugh himself on this occasion. One of my fellow-students, as we were going away from the meeting at which Dr. Harbaugh had spoken, remarked: "What a splendid lawyer he would have made!" What impressed me most, however, was, not his fitness for the vocation of a lawyer, but the sadness and sorrow which he evidently had suffered because of the alienation and opposition he had encountered from a part of his congregation.

Dr. Harbaugh became pastor of St. John's Reformed Church at Lebanon, Pa., in October, 1860. I remember seeing him there, and passing some time with him, in the summer of 1861, when circumstances called me to Lebanon. I remember that, on that occasion, I attended a Sunday morning service at his church, and heard him preach a sermon from the text, "Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." It is one of the comparatively few sermons which stand out clearly and distinctly in my memory; for it made a deep impression on my mind. It was an earnest and impressive plea for mercy and forgiveness, for the gentle and charitable judging of our fellow-men. One striking passage in it expressed the same idea which Robert Burns expresses when, speaking of men's judgment of those who fall under temptation, he says: "They

know not what's resisted." I remember taking dinner, on that same occasion, at Dr. Harbaugh's house, and that, after dinner, he read to me the Pennsylvania-German poem entitled "Das Alt Schulhaus an der Krick," which he had then recently written, but which had not yet been published. He did me the honor of discussing with me this very remarkable poem, and explained to me certain terms which I, having only an imperfect and acquired knowledge of the dialect, did not fully understand. I find, from the form in which it stands at present, that one or two stanzas were afterwards materially changed, certain expressions in them having probably struck him as being too broadly English. For example, one stanza, in the form in which he read the poem to me, was as follows:

Bees war er! das muss ich geshtheh
G'wippt hot er all around;
Gar kreislich gute Ruhls obsarvt;
Und wer Schleg kriegt hot, hot's deservt,
Completely, I'll be bound.

These English words and phrases were afterwards exchanged for expressions more German.

One of the most remarkable and characteristic things done by Dr. Harbaugh was his writing the series of Pennsylvania-German poems, of which the one of which we have been speaking is an example, and to which it became the introduction. These poems are, in their way, works of genius. Their author came of Pennsylvania-German people; he never lost his sense of identification with them; he knew their life; he thought their thoughts and felt their feelings; and he did for them what no one had ever done before—he became a voice to them, he gave utterance to them. There is in these poems that blending of realism and idealism which is characteristic of all true works of art: they are intensely realistic, they are also intensely idealistic. He saw, with the vision of a poet, what was good, true, beautiful and tender in the Pennsylvania-German life, home, family, character; and he became the interpreter of it. He said the things which they had tried to

find utterance for, but could not. And the effect was what it always is when such a thing is done: when some one arises to give expression for others to the thoughts and feelings which they had been, unconsciously or subconsciously, dumbly and vainly, trying to express. When people are spoken to in their own mother-tongue, by one of themselves, they listen. When Paul "stood on the stairs," at Jerusalem, and "beckoned with his hand unto the people," there was "a great silence"; and when they heard him speak to them in their own tongue, they "kept the more silence." When Dr. Harbaugh spoke to the Pennsylvania-German people in their own tongue, when he interpreted for them the things pertaining to their own peculiar and hitherto unexpressed life, they listened intently. These poems went straight to their hearts; they became very precious possessions in many a Pennsylvania home.

On the same occasion to which I am referring, Dr. Harbaugh did me the honor of consulting me as to the addition of another stanza to the beautiful poem, "Through Death to Life." He had seen or heard of a legend to the effect that the sweetness of the nightingale's song originally came from its having been pierced by a thorn; the wound, as it grieved over it and nursed it in solitude, wringing the sweet melody from the bird. He inquired whether I knew of this legend, and talked of adding another stanza to the poem, having the nightingale and its song for its theme. I remember mentioning this circumstance in an article in *The Reformed Church Messenger*, in certain reminiscences added to a review of the biography of Dr. Harbaugh by his son, Linn Harbaugh, Esq., and saying at that time that the intention of an additional stanza had probably not been carried out. This statement, based on the fact that no such stanza appears in the poem as it stands in the published volume of his poems, was afterwards corrected by the wife of my brother, Dr. John B. Kieffer, who was an intimate friend of Dr. Harbaugh and his family. Dr. Harbaugh, it appears, had written the stanza concerning the nightingale, and had given a manuscript copy of it to Mrs.

Kieffer, then Miss Troupe. My recollection is that this correction was made, and the stanza in question published, in the *Messenger*, soon after the publication of the article to which I have referred.

After this I did not see Dr. Harbaugh again until the month of January, 1864, when he came, as professor of systematic theology, to the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, in which I was then a student. I had the honor, as the appointed representative of the students, of delivering the address of welcome when they called in a body to present their respects to the new professor. This address was afterwards published in the *Messenger*, as a part of the account of Dr. Harbaugh's reception by the Seminary; and the recollection of it is interesting to me, not only because it brought me into a certain special relation to Dr. Harbaugh at an important time in his life, but also because of the circumstance that, as far as I remember, it was the first production of my pen that ever was printed.

Not long after Dr. Harbaugh came to the Theological Seminary, I was obliged to leave it for a time. For I was working my way through the Seminary, and, my resources being exhausted, I, in order to make sufficient money to finish my course, accepted an invitation to return to Middletown, Md., and resume the school connected with the Reformed congregation in that place, which I had previously taught, from 1861 to 1862. I mention the circumstance only because of the connection of Dr. Harbaugh with my return to Maryland on that occasion. I had the honor of being his companion on that journey, for he was going to Middletown at the same time, to assist the Rev. Mr. Rupley at the Easter Communion service. The journey was by stage to Greencastle, by railway to Hagerstown, and then again by stage. It was the 25th day of March, 1864, and the weather was such as often occurs in the neighborhood of Easter; a slight snow was falling, half melting as it fell. Dr. Harbaugh had with him his son Lange, then a little boy, and when, during the long stage-ride across the

mountain, the child became weary and restless, he amused him by repeating rhymes about St. Patrick driving the snakes out of Ireland, St. Patrick's Day having occurred just a week before. This, and other incidents of the journey, brought out that light and playful side of his nature, which was one of the most charming characteristics of the man. To this day, whenever the last days of March come, and bring with them, as they never fail to do, such weather as we had that day, there comes to me very vividly the recollection of Dr. Harbaugh as he was on that journey.

In September, 1865, I returned to the Seminary for my third and last year. The faculty had by that time been entirely changed from what it was when I entered the institution in 1862. Dr. Schaff, Dr. Wolff and Professor Reilly were gone; Dr. Harbaugh, Dr. Higbee and Professor Kerschner were in their places. Again I became a pupil of Dr. Harbaugh; sat under his instruction in the lecture-room; heard him preach, now in the Seminary Chapel, now in the Mercersburg church. Dr. Harbaugh's brief career as a theological professor was characterized by extraordinary industry and activity. He entirely won the hearts of the students, and exerted a powerful influence over them. I have reason gratefully to remember, not only his lectures on dogmatics, but also those on homiletics and the Heidelberg Catechism. I remember well his encouraging remarks when he handed back to me the manuscript of a sermon which had been submitted to him for criticism, and also when he criticized a sermon which, by appointment, I had preached, without manuscript, under very difficult circumstances.

Some of my most cherished recollections of Dr. Harbaugh are associated with the old Seminary Chapel. I had taken an active part in the work of raising the money for the transformation of the battered and unsightly old lecture-room of the Seminary into what seemed to us, perhaps partly because it was our own work, a beautiful chapel. In this work of reconstruction Dr. Harbaugh took a deep interest. In this

chapel we met for morning and evening prayers; and here services were held on Sunday morning, which were attended not only by the Seminary students, but also by the students of Mercersburg College, which had then just been established; and at these services the sermons were preached, now by Dr. Harbaugh, now by Dr. Higbee, now by Dr. Apple. Especially precious to me are my recollections of the evening prayers, which we were accustomed to call "Vespers." Again, at times, I seem to be sitting in my place by the window; my fellow-students around me; Dr. Harbaugh conducting the service; the sun going down behind the North Mountain. How solemn sounds the Word of God, as read out here; how sweet the hymn, "Forever with the Lord," a favorite of Dr. Harbaugh's, sung to the tune of "Lake Enon," to which we always sung it then, and with which I have always since associated it. The recollection of these things is very precious. So beautiful were those days; so congenial the cloistered seclusion of that Seminary life; so delightful that companionship, that, had it depended on me, I would have prolonged that last year indefinitely. The end came all too soon. My six classmates and I at last stood before Dr. Harbaugh as he delivered the parting address. I can still hear him saying: "Go, and, as ye go, preach, saying: The kingdom of heaven is at hand."

This was in May, 1866. In the summer of that year, at the Alumni Reunion of Franklin and Marshall College, I heard the after-dinner speech by Dr. Harbaugh, of which Dr. N. C. Schaeffer speaks in the introduction to the biography. It impressed me very much as it did him. There was something unique and extremely interesting in it. It struck me as having in it something of the perfection and glorification of impromptu and spontaneous utterance.

In May, 1867, I saw Dr. Harbaugh again. It was at the annual meeting of the Mercersburg Classis, memorable to me as the first meeting of Classis attended by me as a member. A considerable number of the members of the Classis had driven across the mountains from Mercersburg, where they

had been attending the commencement of the Theological Seminary, to Pattonville (as the place was then called), Bedford County, where the meeting of Classis was held. The journey occupied portions of two days. It was in a pouring rain that we drove into Pattonville, and it rained almost throughout the entire meeting of Classis. The weather was not only wet, but also cold; and, to make matters worse, the kind people, in making arrangements for the entertainment of the Classis, had, as a part of their housecleaning, taken down their stoves. The houses were not only becomingly clean, they were uncomfortably cold. Even at this distant day I have shivering recollections of that my first meeting of Classis, and the only meeting of the Mercersburg Classis attended by me. Dr. Harbaugh had not arrived with us, but had come in, through rain and mud, late on Saturday night. It was on this occasion that I had the honor of performing for him an act of humble service; it was nothing else, indeed, than that of blackening his boots. On Sunday morning, when Dr. Harbaugh was making his preparations for church, at which he was to preach the Communion sermon, it was evident that his boots, which were very muddy, needed to be cleaned and polished. I offered to do it for him; and, while I was engaged in this humble performance, he regarded me benignly, and said: "That is a good boy; you are fulfilling Scripture; the Scriptures say: 'Ye ought to blacken one another's boots.'" When those who were present and looking on laughed at this remark, he defended it; he said: "Indeed, that is what the words mean; blackening boots to-day is substantially what the washing of feet was in that country and at that time." I like to think that I was permitted, on this occasion, to do some thing, and especially to do this particular thing, for Dr. Harbaugh. It was, as it were, a symbolical act, expressive of the respect and reverence which I entertained for him. It also possessed a certain significance as a sort of farewell action. For, though there was then no sign nor suspicion of what was coming, his course was even then drawing to its close. The

meeting of Classis that was my first was his last. Before the close of that year, it was destined that his earthly life should come to its comparatively early termination.

Only once more, and for the last time, I saw Dr. Harbaugh, in the following summer. It was on a railway train that we met. He had a certain request to make of me in regard to the congregation at Hagerstown, which had for three years been without a pastor, and which, during the latter part of that interim, had with some regularity been supplied with services by himself and Dr. Higbee. He said: "It is known that you will not go to Hagerstown to preach a trial sermon; you have already refused to go there. But the congregation is without a minister; services need to be held there; and I want you to promise me that, if you are invited to go there and hold service, you will do so." Being used to doing as he desired, I gave him my promise; which, a month or more afterwards, I fulfilled by going to Hagerstown and preaching to the congregation there, in August, 1867. The last thing I did for Dr. Harbaugh was to make him this promise, the fulfilling of which led to my becoming the pastor of the Hagerstown charge in January, 1868. I have always considered my settlement at Hagerstown as chiefly due to Dr. Harbaugh. And, as I preach the Gospel from this pulpit, the thought of him, and of his kindly interest in me, as a boy at College, as a student in the Theological Seminary, and as a young minister, and of the many times that he himself preached from the same pulpit, is often present with me. And the thought of him comes to me always like a benediction.

When Dr. Harbaugh passed away, on the 28th of December, 1867, my brother's telegram announcing his death failed to reach me. Having recently resigned the Huntingdon charge, in order to accept a call to Hagerstown, I was at that time visiting my sister in the neighborhood of Lock Haven, Pa. I did not receive the telegram until my return to Huntingdon, when it was too late for me to attend the funeral. I shall never forget my brother's regret, and my own, that I

was not able to be there. I was present at the ceremony of the unveiling of the monument over his grave in October, 1870. The sense of loss and desolation that came upon many of us when Dr. Harbaugh passed away reminded one of a remark made by Principal Shairo of the time when Dr. J. H. Newman ceased preaching at St. Mary's Church, Oxford. He says: "How vividly comes back the remembrance of the aching blank, the awful pause, which fell on Oxford when that voice had ceased and we knew that we should hear it no more. It was as when, to one kneeling at night, in the silence of some vast cathedral, the great bell, tolling solemnly overhead, has suddenly gone still."

Dr. Harbaugh was what he was largely because of the people he came from. He came of strong and rugged stock. Of great importance is the matter of stock; and very significant, sometimes, the contrast between the homeliness or unsightliness of the producing stock and the rarity and refinement of its ultimate product. The order always is, "first that which is natural, and then that which is spiritual." "Good human stock," says a high authority, "is the main dependence. No great poet ever appeared except from a race of good fighters, good eaters, good sleepers, good breeders. Literature dies with the decay of the unliterary element." The unliterary stock of which Dr. Harbaugh came was such as is here described. Generations of farmers lay back of him; plain people, representing well the people of whom, for the most part, the membership of the Reformed Church is composed, and also a large part of the population of the country. For many generations they had lived on the soil, plainly, simply, obscurely. Long had they lived in silence; much had they learned by silent brooding, toiling, striving, struggling, suffering. At last there came from amongst them a voice, through which, in some degree, the thoughts and feelings might find utterance which generations of inarticulate living had been laying up in store. It is always thus: first darkness, and then light; first silence, and then speech; first the accumulation of thought and feel-

ing, and then the articulate expression of them. It has been said that "it takes a great deal of life to make a little art." It takes a great deal of human living to produce a genius. The elect personality, when he appears, comes not extemporaneously, suddenly, arbitrarily, independently, unaccountably. His coming has long been prepared for; he "cometh from afar"; he is the natural product of the life of his people; the uncommon is the offspring of the common. Carlyle calls Dante "the voice of ten silent centuries." When nature brings forth a man like Dr. Harbaugh, it is on the principle of the century plant, which he himself celebrates in his poem, "Through Death to Life." "By the humble growth of a hundred years it reaches its blooming time." When he was born, a hundred years ago this year, the life of the simple, strong, rugged people from whom he sprang reached its blooming time.

It was of such people that he came; and from them he never parted. One of the most remarkable things in his life is the manner in which he continued to the end to be identified with his people. In a certain sense, indeed, he may be said to have departed from them. He was the first, apparently, to break away from his people; to forsake the ancestral mode of life; to seek for himself a better education and a wider sphere of activity. But the breach was only an outward and apparent one; notwithstanding the external detachment, he continued throughout his entire life one with his people. Nay, rather, it was by this means that he became identified with them and representative of them in such a degree as would not otherwise have been possible. This is one of the marks of the strong man; he is always of his people; he bears the impress of his origin; he smacks of the soil in which he grew. He does not quarrel with the soil in which God ordained that he should be rooted; he believes it to be a good soil. He does not despise the people to whom God appointed that he should belong; he believes them to be a good people. He takes the nature which he has inherited, and by all legitimate and avail-

able means seeks to develop, strengthen, refine and perfect it, but by no means to break its connections or destroy its individual and characteristic quality. Whatever a man's intellectual and moral heritage may be, there is always room for the indefinite enlargement, expansion, improvement and refinement of it; only, there must be no breach of continuity; especially must there be no repudiation of the original base. A man, to be strong, influential and achieving, must be rooted in reality. Dr. Harbaugh was rooted in rugged reality. He was of his people; he belonged to them, and they belonged to him. And it was this that gave him influence and power over them; that made him an interpreter for them and a leader of them. Two things are necessary that a man may become a leader and an interpreter for his people: first, he must be identified with them; secondly, he must in some sense be apart and aloof from them. He must be at once of them and above them; of them, that they may follow him, for "a stranger will they not follow"; above them, that he may be able to lead and guide them onward and upward. Why, indeed, is any man stronger than others, except that he may help them; or wiser than others, except that he may instruct them; or higher than others, except that he may lift them up?

Dr. Harbaugh was what he was largely because of his sense of humor. This was one of his most characteristic qualities. It was, as it always is wherever it exists, a part of the man himself; of the very essence of the man; incapable of being detached. Of this, of the characteristic humor of Dr. Harbaugh, of the things which it led him to say and do, and especially of the things which it caused him to refrain from saying and doing, there would, if there were time, be much to say. We will only say that it was genuine humor, as distinguished from wit, which, though often associated with it, is an entirely distinct thing. The larger includes the smaller; the man who possesses humor generally possesses some measure of wit also; but the man of wit is not necessarily endowed with humor. Wit is intellectual; humor is moral. Wit is a

flash; humor is an atmosphere. Wit has its very essence in brevity and condensation; humor is diffusive and pervasive. Wit is capable of being bitter; humor is always genial and kindly. Wit, especially in the form of sarcasm, may be described as concentrated frost; humor, as pervasive sunshine. Wit is capable of being associated with levity; humor is as different from levity as can be. The wit is capable of sneering; the man of humor never sneers. It was Paley who said of Montaigne: "He sneers; and who can refute a sneer?" In the humor of Dr. Harbaugh there was never anything akin to sneering. Rather, it may be said, it was part of the kindly disposition, the general sanity, the "sweetness and light" that were characteristic of the man. It was the accompaniment and the expression of a certain "sweet reasonableness." There was that in it which reminded one of a remark once made by the Earl of Clarendon. Some one asked Edward Hyde, the Earl of Clarendon, on one occasion, why it was that, amid all the downfalls and risings again of his busy career in the days of King Charles and Cromwell, he had yet kept his spirits even. His answer was a memorable one: "I have observed," he replied, "that the mood of humor is the mood of right reason. I have therefore never feared for myself so long as I have had this life-long companion by my side." Dr. Harbaugh's humor struck one as being, in a remarkable manner, "the mood of right reason."

In some respects, however, what seems to us the most remarkable and characteristic thing in Dr. Harbaugh, the thing having most to do with making him what he was, and the reason why he was able to accomplish what he accomplished for the people to whom his life was given, was his poetical temperament. The historian, John Richard Greene, says of the great statesman, Edmund Burke, "The philosophical cast of Burke's reasoning was unaccompanied by any philosophical coldness of tone or phrase. The groundwork of his nature was poetic. His ideas, if conceived by the reason, took shape and color from the splendor and fire of his imagination." The

same may be said of Dr. Harbaugh; the groundwork of his nature was poetic. This peculiar quality pervaded all that he was and all that he did; it characterized all his thinking, his preaching, his writing, his teaching. If he became a theologian and a theological teacher, it was as one who was a poet first. It was characteristic of him to perceive and express truth, not so much after the manner of logic and dialectics, as rather in a certain poetic manner. Some years ago the election of an eminent theologian to a professorship in Andover Theological Seminary was objected to because of his alleged habit of conceiving the truth "sentimentally and poetically rather than speculatively and philosophically." The same objection might have been made to Dr. Harbaugh. Indeed, when one thinks of it, the same objection might be made against all the greatest teachers of mankind, from Isaiah down to John, and from John down to the present day. It would seem to have been characteristic of all the great religious teachers, of all by whom men have been most profoundly moved, that they conceived truth "sentimentally and poetically rather than speculatively and philosophically." It is not that logic was wanting in their perceptions and utterances; but that they were not primarily, much less exclusively, logicians; that there was in them a subtle and mysterious quality which imparted to them a power that logic could never have given. There was something of the poetic spirit in them. They were seers before they were logicians. They were followers of him who said, "I, John, saw." The chief teachers of the human race have always been its seers. There are men of observation, who report what they observe; and there are men of logic, who define, and explain, and reason; and there are men of insight and vision, who see and interpret spiritual and eternal truth. All these are important; but of higher rank than the reporter, and of higher rank than the mere logician, is the seer and the interpreter. Such, in his day, and in his way, and in his degree, was Dr. Henry Harbaugh.

Such are some slight reminiscences of, and such a few of the thoughts suggested by, the personality and character of that interesting and remarkable man the one hundredth anniversary of whose birth we are to-day gratefully commemorating.

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

II.

ANGLICANISM AND PURITANISM.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

The English Reformation had its own antecedents, formative ideals, and mode of procedure. It renounced Romanism but was in sympathy with Catholicism. It was indebted to the work of Luther and of Calvin, and yet it was different from both. It incorporated new developments without forsaking ancient traditions. The uniqueness of the English reform was the result of various factors and forces.

The conciliating Melancthonian mildness and hesitancy of Cranmer the guiding genius of the Edwardean reformation, the moderating influence of Erasmian humanism, the political diplomacy of Henry VIII and Elizabeth, the unyielding absolutism of the Stuarts and the resolute non-conformity of the Puritans, the endeavor to placate religious groups of various types and of various degrees of aggressiveness, the natural conservatism of the English nation, the absence of an original and epoch-making reformer, who, by his own spiritual struggles, found his way out of Catholicism into evangelicalism and wrought his experience into new ecclesiastical institutions —for all these reasons the Reformation in England had the variety of life more than the consistency of logic.

Its external history covered a far longer stretch of time than the Continental Reformation. The work of Luther and of Zwingli was practically finished when the Diet of Augsburg met in 1530. The lines of demarcation as then drawn between Protestants and Catholics on the one hand, and between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians and the Anabaptists on the other, have remained unchanged to the present time. In England the reformation extended over a period of a century and

a half, from the Acts of Succession and Supremacy under Henry VIII, 1534, to the Toleration Act under William and Mary, 1689. The stages of reform during the reigns of the kings and queens of this time may be characterized as mediating, aggressive, reactionary, conciliatory, defiant, revolutionary, restorational, and tolerant.

The separation from Rome under Henry VIII was a political act and was little more, so far as religion was concerned, than a preparation for the reforms under Edward VI embodied in the Prayer Book and the Forty-Two Articles. Mary felt herself called of God to restore the Pope to the headship of the English Church. Elizabeth revived the "middle way" of her father and gave final form to the Established Church. This was followed by a conflict of increasing intensity between the absolutism of the Stuart monarchs and the constitutionalism of the Puritans, which ended in a temporary triumph of Puritanism under the leadership of Cromwell. Then came the restoration of Charles II, followed by James II with strong Catholic predilections. His arbitrary conduct provoked universal antagonism which resulted in his deposition from the throne and in the proclamation of William and Mary as king and queen. The strife between the religious parties which rent England for a century came to a close with the Toleration Act of 1689. In the meantime two systems of Christian thought and life were developed, one known as Anglicanism; the other, as Puritanism. They differ not simply in degree but in kind, in their conceptions of religion, politics, and conduct. This fundamental difference was the primal cause for controversy between king and parliament, prelacy and presbytery, ending in the war between Cavaliers and Roundheads.

I.

The Church of England is hard to classify on account of the mediating character of its authoritative formulas, the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. The history of the successive confessions of faith, from the Ten Articles

to the final revision of the Thirty-Nine Articles, as well as of the gradual transformation of the Roman Service Book into the English Prayer Book clearly shows that the Anglican reformers were in profound sympathy with the German and the Swiss reformation.

Tested by doctrinal statements in the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Church is prevailingly Calvinistic, especially in its definition of the Lord's Supper and of Predestination. The use of leavened bread and the placing of it in the hand of the communicant indicate a Reformed tendency. It was significant, also, that delegates of the English Church attended the Reformed Synod of Dort in 1619. The view of the church and of the relation between church and state show a leaning toward Lutheranism. In at least six of the Thirty-Nine Articles sentences and phrases are taken verbatim from the Augsburg Confession. The articles on grace and faith are soundly evangelical. In the place given the Apocryphal Books of the Bible and the normative value allowed the traditions of the undivided church of the first four centuries, the Anglicans were far more liberal than the Lutherans or the Calvinists and lean toward Catholicism.

One, however, cannot understand the spirit of the Episcopal Church by a study of its doctrinal articles alone. They must be read in the light of the Prayer Book which has shaped the thought and life of the people far more than the Thirty-Nine Articles. While in the Articles the Anglicans went farther away from Rome than the Lutherans, in the Prayer Book they bordered more closely on Catholicism than either Lutherans or Calvinists, clinging fondly to every reputable relic of Roman Catholic tradition and custom. The liturgical service with its priestly solemnity, its various and variegated vestments, its choir boys, its daily devotions in the sanctuary, its confession of faith, absolution, readings, collects, litany and form of communion, suggest to the modern man a Catholic service purified of its objectionable Roman features. This blend of diverse elements in doctrine and liturgy enables one

to understand how consistent and devout Anglicans may be high churchmen leaning hard towards Catholicism, or low churchmen not far removed from Methodism, or broad churchmen in sympathy with the liberal intellectual and social tendencies of the age.

Anglicanism, however, is more than doctrinal articles and forms of prayer. It is a distinctive view of the world and of life, a type of mind and a mood far older than the English Reformation. Seen in this light, its diverse tendencies, its spirit of compromise, its conglomerate of elements, so repugnant to the Puritan, resolve themselves into the harmony and unity of a living organism which defies logical analysis. Its classic exponent is Thomas Hooker, who published the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* in the last decade of the sixteenth century and died the last year of the century. His purpose was a vindication of Anglicanism in the face of the aspersions of its Puritan opponents.

Considered as a type of mind, Anglicanism was Catholic in spirit, using the term in its broadest and best sense. Instead of regarding the divine and human, the supernatural and the natural, the invisible and the visible, the spiritual and the material as antithetic and in irreconcilable contradiction, the one incapable of existing alongside of the other, it considered them as different aspects, with relative value, of the one great reality. The one merges into the other; the one reveals the other. They do not hinder each other nor annihilate each other, as the Puritan thought.

Accordingly the Anglican idea of God and his relation to men differs from that of the Puritan. He is not simply a God of justice who must be glorified by obedience, but he is also a God of joy and beauty and reason. He allows a place for the joy of life, the beauty of art, and the rational activity of the human mind. Instead of limiting God's guidance of men to the word of Scripture, once for all delivered to the saints, Hooker recognizes the divine Spirit as operative in all the higher strivings of men. Scholarship, knowledge, beauty, and

art were accepted as sacred things. In opposition to the Puritan claim of the sole authority of the Bible, Hooker in a single sentence defines the Anglican view of God's manifestation to men. "Some things she (*i. e.*, Wisdom or God) openeth by the sacred books of Scripture, some things by the glorious works of nature; with some things she inspirereth them from above by spiritual influence, in some things she leadeth and traineth them only by worldly experience and practice." Thus the Bible, the work of nature, immediate inspiration, and the discipline of life are avenues of divine truth. The liberal spirit of the Renaissance, which does honor to every human faculty, reacts in Hooker against the narrowness of the Puritan. The Anglican mind does not reject sensuous vehicles for the expression and interpretation of ideals. Literature and art have a divine function when controlled by a divine purpose. "Its danger is to substitute a factitious symbolism instead of discovering the veritable play of what is spiritual in and through what is sensible." The religious ideas of the Puritan on the contrary are realized not in marble or color but in conduct and life, in action public and private. Mrs. Mary Netheway requested that the bronze statues of Venus and Cleopatra and the marble statues of Adonis and Apollo in the garden at Hampton Courts, "monsters which are set up in Privy Gardens," might be destroyed. Cromwell, Puritan as he was, permitted them to remain. He refused, also, a Puritan offer of 20,000 pounds for the privilege of burning the York Minster.

While Hooker turned to the Bible for an unalterable and infallible revelation of Christian doctrine, he considered the polity of the church not a divine ordinance but a human expedient. The same government may not be equally desirable for all national churches. He had, indeed, a profound respect for the Episcopal organization but not because it was essential to the being of the church, rather because it was ancient, efficient, and adapted to further the well-being of the church. Makower, in his *Constitutional History of the Church of Eng-*

land, says: "While the Episcopal is the recognized constitution of the Church of England, it cannot be conceded that that constitution is regarded as essential in the fundamental formularies of the English Church." Nor do the Thirty-Nine Articles contain the doctrine of the divine institution of episcopacy, a claim which was made only in the seventeenth century by the high church party of Archbishop Laud.

The Anglican, true to his ideal, made room for the human elements in life, recognized the humaneness of God and the divineness of man, of man's social, intellectual, and aesthetic nature. His liberal attitude toward the recreations, diversions and sports of life was not necessarily an evidence of worldly frivolity but an affirmation of the divineness of human life in all its phases.

II.

The Anglican reform called forth the Puritan protest. For Puritanism was far more a protest against "the middle way" of the English Church, than against the errors and abuses of Roman Catholicism. It was a reform of a reform, an attempt to complete an incomplete reformation. The difference, however, between Anglicanism and Puritanism was not simply one of degree, but of kind. For in the two systems there are opposing views of religion, two parties in politics, two theories of life and conduct. This fundamental difference was the ultimate motive for controversy tending to a disruption of English institutions; and in the strife of king and parliament, of prelacy and presbytery, that disruption was accomplished. Let us briefly consider the origin, protest, and affirmations of Puritanism in England.

Thomas Fuller, in his quaint way, describes the external history of Puritanism, calling it Non-conformity, as follows: "Non-conformity was conceived in the days of King Edward, born in the reign of Queen Mary (but beyond the sea at Frankfort-on-the-Main), nursed and weaned in the reign of Elizabeth, grew up a youth or tall stripling under King James, and shot up under Charles I to the full strength and stature

of a man, able not only to cope with, but to conquer the hierarchy and its adversary." The fontal springs of Puritanism one will not find on the banks of the Thames but on the shores of Lake Leman, not in Canterbury but in Geneva. In the Preface of the Ecclesiastical Polity, Hooker says: "A founder it had, whom, for mine own part, I think incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy, since the hour it enjoyed him." He refers to John Calvin.

The doctrine and discipline of the Genevan Reformer came into England in various ways. Leaders in church and state were in correspondence with Bullinger at Zurich, Calvin at Geneva, and other representative Protestants in Switzerland and in Germany. Men like Martin Bucer, of Strassburg, and Peter Martyr, a native Italian and a convert to the Reformed faith, were invited to teach in Oxford and Cambridge, and their influence favored Calvinism or Zwinglianism. Refugees of the Reformed faith from Holland and France were hospitably received in England and permitted to establish congregations with their own government and worship. Eminent men, bishops, deans, and doctors of divinity, were driven out of England in the reign of Queen Mary and found refuge in continental cities—Strassburg, Frankfort, Basel, Zurich, and Geneva. Here they were taught a conception of Christianity different from that of the Prayer Book and the Forty-Two Articles of Edward VI. After the death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth the English exiles returned to their native land, 1558, but they were no longer the same men who had fled a decade before. They had caught the spirit of the Calvinistic churches abroad, and were bent on "carrying the Reformation to its logical results." Mr. J. R. Green says: "Protestantism had become a fiercer thing; and was pouring back from Geneva with dreams of revolutionary changes in church and state."

In its earliest stage, from about 1560 on, Puritanism was a protest against the ritualism of the English Prayer Book, its remnants of papistical idolatry. About the year 1564, the

word "Puritan" began to be used to designate those who sought the purest form of worship—the "*religio purissima*." Then a large proportion of the Established Church were Puritans who desired to remain within the church but refused to conform to practices which seemed to them "badges of Rome." As early as 1565 Puritans of London held meetings in private houses where they read the Bible and sermons. The Spanish Ambassador in 1568 wrote to King Philip: "Those who call themselves of the *religio purissima* go on increasing. They are styled Puritans because they allow no ceremonies, nor any forms save those which are authorized by the bare letter of the Gospel. They will not come to the churches which are used by the rest nor will they allow their ministers to wear any marked or separate dress. Some of them have been taken up, but they have no fear of prison." Among the objectionable features in the English church service, enumerated by the Puritans in the Millenary Petition of 1603, are: the use of "the cross in baptism; interrogatories ministered to infants; confirmation, as superfluous; baptism not to be administered by women; the cap and surplice not urged; that examination may go before communion; that it be ministered with a sermon; that the longsomeness of the service be abridged; church songs and music be moderated to better edification; that the Lord's Day be not profaned; no popish opinion to be any more taught or defended; no ministers charged to teach their people to bow at the name of Jesus; that the canonical Scriptures only be read in the church." The purpose of the Puritan, according to this program, was not to abolish the Book of Common Prayer, but to purify it of certain Romish superstitions and to harmonize it with doctrines and practices of the Sacred Scriptures.

On the heel of the protest against cap and surplice, cross and ring, and other "dregs of popery," came the protest against prelacy or episcopacy. The nature and government of the church and its relation to the state became a vital issue. In *Admonitions to Parliament* (1572) by Field and Wilcox,

a Puritan manifesto, this phase of the controversy is clearly stated. "Neither is this controversy between them and us as for a cap, a tippet, or a surplice, but for great matters concerning a true ministry and regiment of the Church according to the Word, which things once established the others melt away of themselves." A government of bishops was as repugnant to the rigorous Puritan as the papacy, for both alike were mere human devices and not a divine ordinance in the New Testament. In the heat of controversy he denounced it as anti-Christian.

The Puritans, however, differed among themselves on the form of church government. There were three groups. The one may be called the Episcopal Puritans who accepted the liturgy and the government of bishops and desired to remain in the Established Church in the hope of purifying it of its Romish superstitions and of reforming its doctrine and morals. They agreed with Bishop Hall that it was "better to swallow a ceremony than to rend a church." They said: "We separate not from the Church of England but from its corruptions." The second class were the Presbyterian Puritans who favored a state church, but in place of an establishment of bishops they insisted on a government of presbyters or elders, on the ground that it was prescribed in the New Testament. They were thoroughgoing Calvinists. The third group were the Congregational Puritans, known also as Independents and Separatists. They opposed the union of church and state, and maintained that each congregation had the right to control its own affairs without interference from classes, synods, as well as from archbishops and bishops. The Pilgrims of New England were of this kind.

The Puritan protest did not exhaust itself in denouncing superstitions and idolatries, bishops and litanies; it broke into the field of daily conduct. This too was to conform to the Word of God in the Scriptures. They attacked the May-poles and the frolics around them. They inveighed against extravagance in dress and the other social follies of the time.

They introduced the rigorous observance of the Sabbath. Perhaps the oldest extant statement of the early Puritan ideal of Sabbath-keeping is the following (1573): "There were no people walking abroad in the service time; no, not a dog or a cat in the street, neither any tavern door open that day, nor wine bibbling in them, but only alms, fasting and prayer." "We are accused," says the Anglican Hooker, "as men that will not let Christ Jesus to rule over them, but have wilfully cast his statutes behind his back, hating to be reformed, and made subject to the scepter of his discipline."

Puritanism was more than a protest; it was the affirmation of an ideal controlling every phase of human life. Its cardinal principle was the sole and exclusive authority of Scripture; or, in other words, its dominant purpose was to make the will of God prevail in the lives of men. To quote Hooker again: "They hold that one only law, the Scriptures, must be the rule to direct in all things, even so far as to the 'taking up of a rush or a straw.'" All laws found in the Bible are of permanent and universal force; no law derived from any other original can be of permanent obligation. This is Calvinism reproduced on English soil and in opposition to Anglicanism. The ideal of the latter is far broader and more comprehensive. In addition to the Scriptures, the Anglican allows a place for reason, the tradition of the church, and even direct revelation. Yet we can clearly see how Protestants, in the appalling loss of the infallibility of Rome, cast themselves, through the instinct of a supreme need, upon the infallibility of Scripture and the right of private judgment.

In the light of their ideal one can readily understand the intense hostility of Puritanism against all merely human inventions and prescriptions in doctrine, worship, government, and conduct. Their maintenance was a denial of the living God and a reversion to Romish superstition and pagan idolatry. The doctrine of divine sovereignty meant that God's will in nature, in conscience, revealed and sealed in the Scriptures, is the only guide in life. Before the great Ruler of the

Universe self-interest is subdued, human passion is restrained, and the mandates of kings and bishops are powerless. Away with aught that contradicts the divine will.

Strange as it may seem; the doctrine of human freedom is a corollary of divine sovereignty. For man is responsible only to his Maker, not to king or priest. "The meanest peasant," says Mr. J. R. Green, "once called of God, felt within him a strength that was stronger than the might of kings. In that mighty elevation of the masses, which was embodied in the Calvinistic doctrines of election and grace, lay the genius of the modern principles of human equality." In politics the outcome of Puritanism was democratic theocracy, not a government by the people but a government of God through the people. For God spoke not only through kings or bishops but through the nation over which kings and bishops ruled. Representative parliaments are as divinely constituted as kings are enthroned. "The nation round about the throne seemed to the Puritan no less divinely ordered a thing than the throne itself."

The sense of social equality naturally grew out of the doctrine of divine sonship, Christian brotherhood, and human freedom. Though for a long time in Puritan England and New England the spirit of aristocracy and caste prevailed in society, it had to yield in time to a democratic social order, a fellowship based not on blood but on brains. The conventional frock coat of an American gentleman, officer of high or low degree in church or state, is a strange contrast to the varicolored vestments of bishops or garments of cavaliers and an evidence of the victory of Puritanism in the parlor reception as well as in an assembly for worship.

Puritanism has played a large part in the making of American life and institutions. Professor Robert E. Thompson says: "Puritanism has become a characteristic feature of the American mind. It has pervaded the religious and social life of the whole country, reaching those bodies which seemed the most remote from its influence. The Canons of the Roman

Catholic Synods of the Archdiocese of Baltimore exhibit its influence, no less than the resolutions adopted by the Conferences and Assemblies of Protestant churches. It has left its trace in our literature and art which are freer from lubricity of any kind than those of any other modern people."

Puritanism has its limitations and defects. It needs the Anglican's liberal and humane vision of life in its wholeness. The two systems ought not to antagonize each other but to blend in a higher unity and proclaim an ideal of life satisfying the Gospel of Jesus and the finest aspirations of the modern man.

LANCASTER, PA.

III.

THE PRESENT TASK OF THE GOSPEL MINISTRY.¹

II Corinthians 5:18-21.

JOHN A. W. HAAS.

No servant of the Lord Jesus Christ and no minister of the Gospel can bring the message which he ought to bring to any age unless he interprets the great truth of Jesus Christ to an age in the way and manner which the age demands. Our own times more than any other make this appeal. We are living in a remarkable age of unrest and change. There can be no doubt that our order is a changing order. There has never happened in all the history of the world such a universal conflict as millions of men are now engaged in. Wherever a widespread war took place in the past, it ushered in a new age. It is our duty and obligation to be prepared for what shall come and to be ready to affirm anew the essential message of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Into this changing age there comes for us who are Protestants the memory of the Reformation. The Four Hundredth Anniversary of the Reformation reminds us of our inheritance, which came to us with the beginning of the modern times. Our problem to-day is whether the truth of the Gospel as confessed by the leaders of the Reformation is the message for our day. It is our particular obligation as ministers and preachers of the evangelical faith to ask ourselves, what are the essential elements of the Reformation message which our age needs? Out of the answer to this question grows the

¹ The Annual Sermon preached at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, at Lancaster, Pa., on May 9, 1917, by the Rev. John A. W. Haas, D.D., LL.D., President of Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.

understanding of our immediate task. To realize this task we shall center our meditation on the word of St. Paul, whose spirit and whose interpretation the Reformation gave again to Christianity. Let us endeavor from the ideal of the ministry which St. Paul, the great missionary, the great organizer of churches, the great theologian, possesses to find our bearings. We shall, therefore, ask

WHAT IS THE PRESENT TASK OF THE GOSPEL MINISTRY?

and our answer shall be

1. To preach the greatest world-fact.
2. To proclaim the greatest world-message.
3. To urge the greatest world-appeal.

1. The whole work of a Christian preacher is justly a ministry. In the conception of Paul as in the idea of Jesus even this highest privilege of testifying to divine truth is a service. St. Paul calls it a ministry of reconciliation. To him the greatest fact that happened in the world was not one effected by human thought or through human power. The greatest deed to him was God's deed. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. It is not in the orderly connection of mere human action, nor in the chain of mere human events, that St. Paul finds the central theme of human history. He does not pin his faith to any great human hero or human thinker. With triumphant force he proclaims that it was God in Christ who lifted men out of the relation of condemnation into the relation of reconciliation. We have a ministry of reconciliation and a service of this atonement because God did something in and through Jesus Christ. We are called as ministers to proclaim not an ecclesiastical program, but a divine fact. The joy of our service is to be able to tell the great act of God on behalf of men.

The Reformation was entirely true to this great ideal. It did not find God in and through the Church. For all Reformers the Church consisted only of those who were in the

faith of Christ. It was not through an organization that God revealed Himself and came to men. In the long development which preceded the Reformation the Church had become the screen that obscured God and not the medium that revealed Him. The maintenance of the organization was more important than the communication of the divine. When the Reformation, therefore, had of necessity to oppose the Church, it opposed it because the Church obscured God. The Church was no medium by which God's fact of reconciliation could be maintained in the world. It was impossible by any liturgical repetition of sacrifice to represent in an unbloody way what the reconciliation of God meant in the living sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

The Reformation was compelled to oppose the mediæval Church, because it could not assent to the idea that God was in the saints in such a manner that they were necessary and a part of the scheme of salvation. It is true that God's power is present in all that believe in Him. Those that are His reflect in their thoughts and lives and acts His glory. But in no merely human life could God effect reconciliation. There can be no medium for men of any kind even through the lives of the most saintly of men. Therefore, the Reformation had to confess that God was not in the saints, to reconcile the world.

But in consonance and agreement with St. Paul the Reformers unanimously confessed that God was in Christ. God's purpose was carried out through Him in whom men could see the Father. It was possible for God to remove the stain and guilt of sin because Christ's sacrifice was God's deed. The glory of the Reformation was the re-discovery of the reconciling God, and of His surpassing love in Jesus Christ. Christ became the center because only thus could God be the center of life and salvation. This truth is still the essential truth of Christianity which the world needs to have proclaimed in all its power and efficiency.

In the present crisis, when old conditions are passing and old relations breaking up, men need the certainty of God. But

they need no absentee God, but one immediately present in the world, present through the personality and life of Jesus Christ. It is not God in terms of the universe, or in terms of might, that men are crying for, but God in the terms of the love of Jesus Christ. It is only as God is thus conceived that He will be the sustaining strength for the souls of men, in the severe trials of the present time. God in Christ is the God of peace over against the hate of the world. The selfish ideas of men, their grasping spirit, their desire for world-possessions and world-power, have all engendered a spirit of unbrotherly envy, jealousy and hate. These can only be overcome by infusing into the modern world the God of love reconciling men in Jesus Christ. The world has been led astray through force. It has glorified power and burnt incense to the Moloch of energy. Efficiency has been identified with the will to power. Power must be overcome by power is the conviction of the present day. But submission created through power will only sow bitterness in the hearts of men. The world needs a strong accentuation of the fact that love is mightier than power. It must be convinced if it can be that God is in the world as love through Jesus Christ, and that love ready to sacrifice and ready to die is mightier than death. Bodies may be destroyed, countries may be devastated, empires may fall, but love cannot be conquered. It is victorious even when it is overcome through human force. Love is the power of God winning men back through Jesus Christ. Such is the central theme, such is the soul of the message which it is our task to proclaim.

2. But this question is still before us: How shall the great world fact be made potent in the world? In what way shall God in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, lifting them back into His love, be brought home to the hearts of men? We must go back to the very nature of the fact of the reconciliation itself. When God was in Christ not imputing men's trespasses to them, He was in the Word. Christ Himself is the Word. All that He is and all that He says tells us what God is. Christ is the Word because He is the expression and

revelation of God. And, therefore, St. Paul, although the time was not yet ripe for John to call Christ the Word, nevertheless linked the act of God in Christ with the word of reconciliation. But why could the word of reconciliation bring this fact to the world? The only inner philosophy that seems possible is that which John finally announces, because Christ is the Word. Therefore the Word and the message of Christ brings the Christ. The Word of Christ, of the reconciling Christ, the atoning Christ, in whom God was acting, is spirit and life. The way in which the world must be convinced is through the word of truth, because the word of truth is Christ the truth, Christ the power, Christ the life. And, therefore, the world-fact leads to the world-message, and reveals to us the doctrine of the Word of God through which the fact of God reconciling the world in Christ is real.

The doctrine of the Word as the power of God unto salvation was one of the great ideals of the Reformation. The Reformers did not conceive of the world as in need of a larger body of tradition. The question was not one of fuller knowledge, but one of vital power to deliver and save. The Reformation could not accept any tradition, interesting as it might be and true in part as it might be, as constitutive in the mediation of the love of God to men. There was in the tradition no guarantee of the direct life of Christ, the Word. The Reformation was not interested primarily in the Scriptures as historical documents. The vessels of the different books in which the treasure of saving truth is kept were not of first importance. It mattered little if we have this treasure in earthen vessels, the essential part was that we have the treasure. The Word could not be crowded back by any form of organization. It was not to be set aside as a life-giving factor in favor of a dramatic service. Therefore, there could be no evangelical worship in which the preaching of the message of Jesus Christ was not the outstanding feature. The great Word that delivers men was no private mystic communication, it was no mere inner light of imagination, reflection or reason. With all earnestness this truth is main-

tained in the Reformation that the Word proclaiming forgiveness of sins and the reconciliation of God through Christ was the living truth embodying and carrying with it Christ, the Life and the salvation of men.

Is it not true that even to-day there is naught else that can conquer the world but free and vital truth? If we believe as we do that the greatest world-fact must come through the greatest world-message, it is our obligation to make this world-message effective. What the Church needs to-day is not more social reformers, or better organizers, or sweeter musicians, but above all mightier preachers. The power of God can still become effective for saving men through the Word, but we need preachers who, forgetting themselves and their desires and their ideas, are willing to become the mouthpieces and trumpets of the truth of the Lord. The world is looking for earnest preachers, thoroughly sincere and honest, but it wants to hear in their message the conviction of something else than the possibility of a human philosophy. As long as we preach anything less than the central message of the love of God, reconciling the world in Christ, as long as we preach this in any other manner than that of a divine fact, so long will we be helpless and inefficient. All the changes in the present cry out aloud for a certain voice, a sure message and a convinced messenger, whose proclamation is full of the spirit of the love of God and His reconciling power.

3. St. Paul believes that the bearer of the message after the announcement of his message must come with that which is the greatest appeal. For he says "We pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." This appeal is made because the ministers are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech men through them. An ambassador is called to convey the instructions which have been entrusted to him. He is no private person when conveying his message. His value and his importance are the value of the legitimacy of his message. If his message be legitimate and he acts for the country which he represents, all the dignity and majesty of that country is represented in him. But he is personally only what

he is through his message and not because of anything that he may be through his own personal excellence. And so the ministers of the Gospel in the teaching of St. Paul are ambassadors representing the Christ, beseeching in the name of God, calling upon men and appealing to them that for the sake of Christ, who died and rose for them, they should be willing to have God accept them, and to become reconciled to the reconciliation which God has effected by taking away sin and establishing righteousness in Jesus Christ.

Such was the value which the Reformation, following Paul, put upon the ministry of the Word. It could not accept any ecclesiastical ordinance which constituted a separate priesthood, and made a separate rank and order. Men who brought the message of Christ were not to be regarded as ecclesiastical dignitaries deriving their glory from an organization. All that they were was due to the dignity and power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and not to the ordination by any bishop, or the rank established through any pope. The Reformers could not conceive of any ambassador to represent the Church as a Church apart from Christ, or the Holy See at Rome either in matters spiritual or temporal. They could not accept the prevailing ideas because for them the message was greater than the messenger. It was the message that made the messenger. No church had power to make a real minister of Jesus Christ. It could declare some men to be such messengers because the Word must needs be proclaimed. But any claim by which the Church created offices and made dignitaries was wrong. The Church did not need officers, it needed servants, servants of the Word and bearers of the message. And the content of their appeal was to be an appeal against sin, and the announcement that Christ who knew no sin was made sin for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. Sin was to be removed and righteousness to be established, and Christ stood in the midst to take away sin and to bestow righteousness. These were the three great terms of the Reformation, sin, righteousness and Christ; and the solution of the fact of sin and of righteousness was found in Christ.

Our age needs a strong and mighty appeal. But the appeal cannot be one of logic. We cannot establish men's faith through the clearest reasoning. What reasoning establishes, reason can destroy. The power of appeal cannot be one of mere emotion. Too often men believe in our day that if a great atmosphere of emotion is created and thousands are swept along by mighty currents of feeling, that then the truth becomes effective. But the waves that rise are the waves that fall again. Emotion sweeps over the soul, but frequently does not change it. The appeal must be made to the will of men. When we call out, be ye reconciled, it must be our purpose to approach men that they may form a new resolution. The truth of God must take hold of their conscience through their will. All the power of argument, all the strength of logic, all the impetus of emotion, must be centered upon the human will. And so the problem of our appeal is the problem of changing the human will. We must so present the truth that men shall feel and know that God is knocking at the door of their will for them to decide. And the content of the truth that will effect this is the same as that which St. Paul used, and which the Reformers employed. We must begin with the tremendous fact and experience of sin, and uncover to man his own bound and enslaved will, his impotence in doing the real will of God, and then we must show the glory of the new righteousness, the beauty of the new life, so that the will may desire it and the motives may be aroused. And when the new righteousness has made its appeal and sin has been seen, how can we find the deliverance? By the presentation of the strong Christ, strong in holiness, strong in purity, strongest in love. The key words of our age must become to a vital Christianity the same old key words, sin, righteousness and Christ. And as we learn more and more to make this appeal, and to lift up the eternal Christ before men, we shall be true to our task, and fulfil our purpose to the glory of God and for the blessing of men. Amen.

ALLENTOWN, PA

IV.

WORSHIP IN THE CHURCH.

A. M. GLUCK.

We are living in a new age. The discovery of America, the Protestant Reformation, the Declaration of Independence, the application of the evolutionary theory and the scientific principle and the psychological idea to the different departments of human life are making all things new. Nowhere is this tendency seen more clearly than in the sphere of religion. The term "modern Christianity" is frequently used, referring to principles, tendencies, movements, which are sometimes called "Progressive Christianity," the "New Theology," "Modernism," but which, in reality, are nothing else than a new religious attitude, a new mode of thought, or a new principle of action manifesting itself in all directions. In this new religious atmosphere the cultus of the Church is being born again. The truths of the Gospel are being re-interpreted, and just as we have a new astronomy by being given a new conception of the stars which are always the same, so we are getting a new theology by being given a statement in modern terms of the old Gospel of the Son of God which is eternal. The institution of church government is being re-shaped, and just as the world has largely come into the possession of representative government by the application of the principle of democracy, so the Church is coming to have democratic forms of government by the application of the principle of the universal priesthood of believers. And the same influence is now working in the realm of worship. The Church to-day is in the birth-throes of a new liturgy. The times call, therefore, for a new study of the subject of worship.

What is worship? Worship is the communion of the soul

with the spirit of God. This may not be a complete definition, but it is complete enough for all practical purposes; and the purpose of this paper is practical.

Worship grows out of the kinship that exists between God and man. Man is the child of God, and because he is the child of God, man naturally seeks communion with his heavenly Father. And so we find worship wherever we find humanity. The ancient pagan peoples worshipped, the noblest souls on earth delight in worship, while the angels and archangels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, find no nobler occupation, no higher enjoyment, in the heavenly world, than worshipping forever Him Whose glory fills all earth and heaven. Just in proportion as a man becomes more and more a true man, so much the more does he seek communion with his God.

Worship is essentially spiritual. When men identified God with the forces of nature, which seemed sometimes benevolent and sometimes destructive and sometimes indifferent, it was only natural that the central principle of their worship should be the idea of pleasing him with costly material sacrifices. When man looked upon God as a great sovereign King, whose subjects they were, it was natural that the central principle of their worship should be the idea of homage, adoration, praise. But when men came to think of God as their heavenly Father, dwelling with them and sharing their human experiences, as they did with the coming of Christianity, it was only natural that the central principle of their worship should be the idea of personal communion with Him.

There are three kinds of worship. There is, first of all, private worship. This is the expression of religious emotion by the individual. "When thou prayest," says Jesus, "enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret; and thy Father who seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." Jesus knew the value of private prayer. Communion with God on the mountain top in the early morning was dear to Him. Jesus had things to say to

God that could be said only in the completest privacy. And so does every man. And so we speak of worship as the expression of the devout life, when the heart that believes that God is and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, pours itself out before Him in the solitude of the closet, or in the companionable loneliness of nature, or in the dim light of the house of prayer.

There is, in the second place, family worship. This is the expression of religious emotion by the family. The family is a divine institution. It is God's way to set the solitary in families. He educates the race through the discipline of the family. In primitive times religion went by households; so it did when Christianity was young. Baptism went by households, as in the case of Stephanus and Lydia and the Philippian jailer. The Lord's Supper went by households. Instruction went by households. The Apostles in writing to the saints had a message for the children. No child was to be called an alien, even though only one parent was a Christian, for even in that case a child was not unclean but holy. Christianity in society will fail unless Christianity is kept alive in the home, and Christianity is kept alive in the home by family worship.

A third kind of worship remains to be considered, and that brings us immediately in touch with the specific end of this paper, namely, worship in the church, common worship, congregational worship.

Why do people go to church? Many answers are given to this question. There are those who say that they go to church to hear the sermon. That is often too true. Some folks do go to church to hear a sermon and learn thereby just as they go to a hall to hear a lecture and be instructed thereby. But if this is the only purpose of church attendance it is not necessary to go at all. In these days of cheap printing there are books of devotion and tracts and sermons to be had which contain better preaching than anything they are likely to hear at church. If teaching is all they go to church for they can get

plenty of that at home. Moreover, there is the Sunday School; if knowledge of the Bible is the only thing of importance the Sunday School should take the place of the church service. Furthermore, if the sermon be all they come for, why have prayers and lessons and hymns, which are not sermons at all? What is the use of the service as we call it, if the sermon is the only object for which they come. If the service is only for the opening and closing of preaching might it not be done away with altogether? Church attendance, therefore, must be for more reasons than the hearing of sermons.

There are those who say they go to church to say their prayers. But if that be all, why can they not say their prayers at home? God is everywhere, all-seeing, all-hearing. And is he not as ready to hear in the field, and in the workshop, and in the bed-chamber, as in the church? Isaac went out into the field at eventide to pray. Jesus sought the mountain-top for fellowship with His Father, and Simon Peter used the house-top for communion with the Most High. If the purpose of church attendance is prayer alone then it is not needed at all. Church attendance, then, must be for more reasons than the mere saying of prayers.

With others the music is the all-important thing. They go to church to be entertained for an hour just as they go to the theater and the "movie" and the concert for the pleasure that is to be found there. Hence the "rag-time music," the "operatic singing," and the "brass band" organizations in many of the churches to-day. Now I believe that the church service ought to be made a means of creating joy in the hearts of worshippers, but that is a very different thing from pleasure; joy is a thing of the soul, while pleasure is largely physical. The church cannot compete with the world in the matter of amusement. You cannot entertain people into the Kingdom of God. If the church hopes to do that she might as well close her doors.

We go to church to worship God. We do not go to church to hear sermons only, or to say our prayers only, or to sing

only; we go to church to commune with God and communion with God is worship; preaching and praying and singing are elements of worship because they are means of communion with God; whatever helps to commune with God are legitimate elements of worship. We go to church to worship God.

The habit of assembling together for public worship came by evolution. At first men doubtless believed that God dwelt in some one place, and that it was necessary for them to assemble at that one particular place to worship Him; the worship of the ancient pagan world is always associated with particular places. Later on men came to feel that God had made them into families, and, as a result, whole families met together to worship Him of whom every family in heaven and earth is named; that God had formed them into societies in the form of tribes, and, therefore, whole tribes came together to worship Him Whose laws they were bound to obey in their common social relations; that it was God who had formed them into nations, and not they themselves, and, therefore, they conceived the grand idea of national temples, in which the whole nation should, if possible, worship Him to Whom they owed their existence, their freedom and order and strength, and their mission in the world. And then under the Christian dispensation, men came to see that their own religious aspirations and needs and hopes were the same as those of their fellowmen, whatever their family and racial and national relations might be, and so congregational worship came to be one of the primary functions of the church. In public worship, therefore, we are voicing not only our own religious aspirations and needs and hopes, but those of our family and race and nation, and those of all mankind.

And when we turn to the Bible, that unique record of religious experience, we find this idea coming out in numberless places. "O come let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our Maker" (Ps. 95:6). "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name; bring an offering, and come into his courts. O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness:

fear before him, all the earth" (Ps. 96:8-9). "Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands, serve the Lord with gladness: come before his presence with thanksgiving. Know ye that the Lord he is God, it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people and the sheep of his pasture. Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise" (Ps. 100:1-4). "Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20). "Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but encouraging one another: and so much the more as ye see the day approaching" (Heb. 10:24-25).

From these passages, and many others like them, it is plain that worship is one of the primary functions of the Christian congregation. It takes its place with Evangelization, Social Service, Government, Education, Ordination and Dedication. Individual and family worship are not enough; there must be the worshipping assembly, the coming together, the convening of believers, for communion with God, for a testimony before the world, and for the nourishment and consolation and building up of the body of Christ on earth.

Furthermore, when the devotional spirit manifests itself in acts, it necessarily does so in external forms. This holds true of private worship, of family worship, and of congregational worship. There cannot be any worship in the sense of concrete acts without forms as vehicles of those acts. The symbolic acts which enter so largely into the service of the Roman Catholic Church, the prayer and praise and confession and Scripture-reading and giving of the Protestant services, and the silence of the Quaker meeting-house, are all forms of worship because they are all outward expressions of devotion. And so when Christian believers come together the worship of the assembly naturally assumes external forms of expression.

Now when the members of the congregation join in these acts, these forms, these outward expressions of devotion, you

have liturgical worship. The word "liturgy" is from two Greek words, "loas," meaning "people," and "ergon," meaning "work," and signifies the common devotional acts of the members of the congregation. Liturgical worship, then, is worship in which all the members of the congregation have part. As such it is essentially Protestant, because it is in harmony with the great principle of the universal priesthood of believers. If all Christians are priests then it becomes all Christians to discharge acts of devotion to God, for the primary function of the priest is worship. Of course this does not mean that all the members of the congregation are to take part in every act of worship. This could not be the case with the sermon. The part of the church member here is the hearing ear. That too is worship. Neither must it be thought people cannot join in worship except they join with their voices. Worship may be silent. In some parts of the service there may be music on the part of the representatives of the people that shall be of great spiritual help to the silent worshipper. The sweet notes of the chimes floating down from above upon the assembled worshippers have the power to lift their hearts unto the Lord. Liturgical worship means that all the people shall have large part in such acts of devotion as praise and prayer and confession and Scripture reading and giving.

While it is true that forms of worship are only channels through which religious devotion expresses itself, let us not get the idea that the forms themselves have no value. They have a very great value. By sincerely using them we learn to worship in the right spirit. We learn to love one another by doing the things that love requires. So we learn to worship God by doing the things that worship requires. If we wait until we feel like worshipping God it is not likely that we will ever worship Him. As a rule we delight to do those things that we have learned to do, and oftentimes first of all as a duty.

What now are the elements of church worship? For an answer to this question we may repair directly to the Apostolic Scriptures, there to find, sketched in broad and free-hand out-

lines, not only the institution of Christian worship, but also its essential contents. And strangely enough, these elements are seven in number, as it were a seven-fold gift of the Spirit to instruct the church how to maintain through the ages the vital institution of a serious, suitable, and spiritual worship. The seven elements are as follows: Singing, Reading, Confession, Prayer, Preaching, Giving, and the Administration of the Sacraments. As time went on these elements grew, and some of them became wonderfully fruitful in many directions. Prayer did not continue to remain as simple petition, but came to include invocation, confession of sin and benediction. Reading expanded to include the recitation of calls to worship, the responsive reading of the Psalms, and the pronouncing of declarations of pardon, as well as Scripture lessons. Praise came to be voiced in introits, anthems, chants, psalms, and hymns. And so I might go on, but that would mean an exploration of the whole field of liturgical worship, and that the limits of this paper do not permit. Suffice it to say that in these seven elements of Apostolic worship we have the fundamental elements of all spiritual worship. And what a rich and impressive unity they present! No element is redundant; none is irrelevant; each has its own logical and spiritual relation to the other; each contributes a specific force to the whole volume of energy. All, united, blend as the seven bands of the rainbow, in one radiant symbol of hope. And these elements constitute the framework of all liturgies that have been used in the Christian Church from Apostolic time until to-day. As there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, so also may we venture to say there is, among all Christian people, in the last analysis, one worship.

Having dealt with the nature, forms, and elements of church worship, we proceed now to a consideration of its uses. These uses run out in three directions, namely, toward God, toward the individual self, and toward the great human brotherhood. These will now be considered some little in detail.

The first use of liturgical worship is expressive, that is, to furnish suitable forms through which the congregation can hold communion with God. It is plain that if all the members of the congregation are to commune with God they must have common forms through which they can hold that communion. Unless the congregation agrees on certain forms for this purpose there is no common worship. The services of the church should be so constructed that the whole congregation may take part in them, that they may answer aloud the responses, that they may say Amen at the end of each prayer, just as they read or chant aloud the alternate verses of the Psalms. The minister does not worship for the people, but with them; he is only their leader, their guide. If the members of the congregation are not to join in with their voices there is no reason why the minister may not worship in silence too. The purpose of church worship is to enable the members to hold communion with God as a congregation, and so the entire congregation joins aloud in the worship. The hearing of each others' voices stirs up earnestness, stirs up attention, and by a wholesome infection makes all of the congregation of one mind, as they are of one speech, in holding communion with God.

The second use of church worship is creative. When the worshipper joins aloud with others in worship he awakens his own thoughts, his own feelings, his own aspirations. He speaks to himself, and he reminds himself of God, and of his duty to God, and so openly acknowledges himself bound to believe and to do what he confesses. Our own religious emotions are wonderfully stimulated by common speech, common touch, common giving. We do not make enough of this use of worship. In common worship the individual gets a religious stimulus that can be gotten in no other way. People who think that private worship is all that is necessary need to be shown what can be gotten only in worship where there are the voices of many uniting in expressing their glory to God. Many of us would find our religious emotion growing cold if it were not

for the stimulative effect that we get from our fellow-worshippers in the services of the church.

In considering church worship in relation to the world of humanity we find that it has a three-fold use.

The first is witness-bearing. Church worship is public confession of Christ, united testimony of allegiance to the cause of the kingdom of God, and far-sounding proclamation of the Gospel. The world in which we are living is a noisy world. The Gospel is heard only when it is proclaimed aloud. A congregation of worshipping people is a mighty instrument for the preaching of the Gospel of the Son of God. Paul and Silas preached in Philippi; they were cast into prison; at midnight they prayed and sang and preached; and the prisoners heard; and that night a Christian congregation was born in that city. Every congregation of worshipping people is a testimony to the world of the Gospel as the power of God unto salvation.

The second use of church worship is conservation. The faith once delivered to the saints has been conserved in the worship of the church as in no other way. The reason is that worship belongs to the realm of the heart, and the things of the heart are the most difficult to part with. In an ever-changing world worship has been the unshaken citadel of the faith. The Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Gloria Patri, the Kyrie, the Te Deum, the Sursum Corda, the Baptismal Formula, the Confirmation Blessing, the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, have kept the faith unspotted from the world.

The third use of church worship is edification. The great object of church worship, as contemplated by the Apostles, was edification, instruction, building up the faithful in soberness and righteousness and godliness of living. In the 14th chapter of First Corinthians, which is devoted to a discussion of the principles and modes and purposes of worship, the Apostle says, "let all things be done unto edifying." The great objective purpose of church worship is to instruct the mind in

the things of religion, to fashion the affections so as to delight in God, to reinforce the will so as to move in harmony with the divine will, to mould the character along the lines of holiness, and to give wings to the soul's aspirations.

What are the principles that should govern church worship? We have seen that the elements of worship are singing, reading, confession, prayer, preaching, and giving. Is the use of these elements to be left to chance or caprice or reason? The answer to this question is important. We hold that there are certain principles that should govern the use of the elements of church worship.

The first is the principle of truth. By this I mean that church worship must be true to the Bible. The great trouble with many of the liturgies of the church to-day is that they are theological rather than biblical. It is not the province of a liturgy to inculcate theology; it is the province of a liturgy to inculcate religion; religion and theology are not the same by any means. For example: the Bible teaches that Christ died for our sins; it is the province of church worship to inculcate that truth, but not to explain it. The closer church worship keeps to the Bible the more permanent it will be, the more universal it will be, and the more helpful it will be.

The second is the principle of order. There is a philosophy underlying church worship that cannot be disregarded without doing violence to the religious consciousness. The different elements of worship are intended to create different kinds of moods on the part of the worshippers, but if these moods are to be created the different elements of worship must be so arranged that the creation will come to pass. Praise will grow out of penitence, but penitence does not grow out of praise. Confession grows out of Scripture reading, but Scripture reading naturally does not grow out of confession; confession, then praise. Giving grows naturally out of instruction, but instruction does not naturally follow out of giving. There is order in church worship, and the minister who disregards it does so to the detriment of his people.

The third is the principle of flexibility. There is an order in worship, but order does not preclude flexibility. Order demands that certain kinds of forms be used in certain places in the service; flexibility demands that each kind be constituted of many forms from which to choose; the two principles complement each other. There are some elements that should always be used. The invocation, the confession, the Gloria Patri, the Lord's Prayer, the Benediction belong to this class. They should always be used when the particular service in which they stand is used. In calling to worship, in prayer, and in the use of chants of praise the principle of flexibility should be the rule. Moreover, this principle should apply to the liturgy as a whole. No service should be an exact duplicate of another. The morning, evening and Sacramental services should differ from one another. Furthermore, the services by which the rites of the church are administered should be so constructed as to center attention upon the significance of the rites, and, as a result, they will be highly individualistic.

The fourth is the principle of simplicity. Since liturgical worship is worship in which all the people have part, then it must necessarily be simple. Martin Luther said that he did not write sermons for Melanchthon sitting in the first pew, but for the unlearned servant girl sitting in the last pew. If this should be true of our preaching, it should be just as true of worship. Church worship should be for all; for the young and the old, for the wise and the ignorant, the great and the small. To meet this end it must be couched in the simplest language possible, in Anglo-Saxon words, in Bible language, than which there is none more simple, more beautiful, more powerful. Before we organize junior congregations, and thereby take upon ourselves another heavy burden, let us try a simplified liturgy. I am inclined to think that what will meet the needs of children will meet the needs of all, for, in the things of religion, we are all children. A simplified liturgy will do more to restore the family pew than anything else.

The fifth is the principle of beauty. God manifests his

goodness to us in forms of beauty; the heavens, the mountains, the rivers, the trees, the grain, the flowers, the birds of the air, the cattle upon a thousand hills, the fishes in the sea, declare the goodness of God, and they are all surpassingly beautiful. And if God comes to commune with us arrayed in beauty shall we not go to him to commune with him through the most beautiful forms we can find? To ask the question is to answer it. Congregations should worship the Lord in beautiful temples, surrounded with beautiful symbolism, and through beautiful forms.

The liturgical controversy has happily passed out of the church. This is not due to indifference, nor by the arrangement of a truce; it is because we have gotten hold of a new principle. Liturgical and non-liturgical worship, so long antagonistic to each other, are being beautifully interblended to-day, and we are being saved from the danger of lawlessness and disorder and narrowness on the one hand and formality and monotony and restraint on the other. On this principle a new church worship can be constructed that will approach the ideal. When this work has been wisely done we will worship as one people before the throne of grace.

MARTINSBURG, W. VA.

V.

THE RESTORATION OF THE HEROIC IN HOME MISSIONS.

ERNEST N. EVANS.

A hero is a man distinguished for valor, fortitude, or bold enterprise. That which creates a man a hero is the idea or cause that appears to be worth while. His appreciation is such that he is willing to abandon his life to its call. Every man who is so mastered is a hero, though he may never have the opportunity to do an outstandingly heroic thing. Phillips Brooks has a sentence that runs like this: "Only when a man seizes the idea and meaning of some cause, and in the love and inspiration of that is able to forget himself and go to danger fearlessly because of his great desire and enthusiasm, only then is bravery heroic."

Every human enterprise has its heroes. The new country attracts the hardy pioneer; the gold fields wooed the "forty-niners"; the desire to be rich dares men to risk life, and they do it; the moral cause arouses a Wilberforce, a Willard, a Washington; religion, no matter which one, moves others to die for it; and war—grim, awful, hellish—fills history's pages with the records of glorious deeds of valor. But none has persuaded more unselfish or heroic endeavor than the appeal of Jesus Christ.

The course of the Christian faith is marked by the continuing host of its heroes. Christ came not to bring peace but a sword. To follow Him calls every man to a battle. It is no trifling moment when he is summoned to abandon his sin. It is no weakling task to overcome the world and its attractions. To persuade men to undertake it requires a conviction of the

sufficiency of Jesus Christ. When they see Him, they are won to be heroic.

Jesus Christ stirs up a muss wherever He goes. When He enters men's circles, they never rest content with things as they are. The great evidence of His presence is restlessness—the discontent of higher ideals. It is not the aim of Christianity to better present conditions. The social Gospel is not primary, it is secondary. That follows as a consequence of the distinct effort. It is not in the world to create any form of government, or to submit the final form of the social program. It is here to produce the spirit, and provide the ideal. Consequently, it is in opposition to all but the loftiest; the enemy of all but the finest. It is the foe of all that is good, the staunch advocate of none but the best. This necessarily evokes the finest qualities of manhood. Her warriors are not seen in many moments of brilliant bravery, but in quiet persistence in the pursuit of the highest. The majority of her heroes are at work in some unnoticed corner patiently performing a tedious duty. What he does no one speaks of in the papers. He advocates an unpopular reform. He casts a losing ballot until his ideals come to their own. He turns light on ignorance, he hits corruption, he fights for social justice, he plans a campaign for a greater foothold for the Gospel of his Lord. But nowhere does the heroic step forth so gloriously as in the spreading of the Gospel. The glory and heroism of Christianity lies in its missionary life. It is in the desire for universal extension, the desire to make its Master known to all men, the desire to extend the kingdom at home and abroad, that the Christian religion asserts her finest qualities.

The bravest deeds are found in the story of Christian missions. The finest touches of heroic chivalry are hidden away in the record of the unselfish lives that surrendered every personal ambition to carry the news of salvation to those who sought to take their lives—not on the pages of foreign missions alone, but in pushing out into the frontier, or into the heart of some ignorant and demoralized section of our cities.

Marcus Whitman, Sheldon Jackson, Booker T. Washington, men among the mountain whites, missionaries among the atheistic foreigners! These and a host of others have the stamp of the heroic upon them, as well as those whose names cause the story of foreign missions to glow with such brilliance. The work of the latter has the greater heroic appeal. Its work is on the battle front, and in the spectacular sphere. It has the advantage of the fewer number. But the home missionary endures the severer test—the doing of duty without the anticipation of ever having a revealing flash that will manifest its glory. His career may seem tame, but his heroism is no less wonderful. The work of the home missionary is becoming less conspicuous every year, and the character of the work is changing, but the same spirit as of other days is required.

Our subject implies that the heroic is passing from the field of home missions. The appeal to found new points, to labor in needy sections is losing its force. Our young men feel no challenge to valor in the call of the homeland. There are no unconquered wilds now-a-days. If we were to look into the matter, we would find some evidences of the truth of the fact. To be known as a home missionary is to descend in the estimation of the ordinary church member. They have the idea that such are pastors of some little insignificant church in a remote corner, whose existence depends upon their forbearance. They somehow have the notion that the pastor is there because he could not get a church anywhere else. They have gotten the idea that the man who has ability belongs to the church of the well-to-do, and are unable to conceive that such may be doing a vaster work in caring for the infant interests. In our church bodies, our synods and assemblies, what rank has the consecrated home missionary? What proportion of the positions on the boards does he occupy? What right gives the pastor of a large church, who has never met the home mission problems face to face, over the man who knows them first hand? How frequently do such ascend to the chair of Moderator or President? Never! Unless by some stroke of outstanding ability,

he asserts his personal worth, then place is made for him; not because of recognition of that valuable phase of the church's work. Again, what do we find when we step inside the Seminary? Are they moulding heroes? Are they creating in the students the ideal that a life of unselfish sacrifice is the first ambition of the man of God? Are they pointing out above all claims the land that remains to be possessed? Are they fostering the spirit that is willing to pioneer, that is eager to initiate? Are they developing men who can redeem failing conditions? Or are they filling men with the methods and ideals that prepare them to fill our vacant charges? One cause for the diminishing ranks of students for the ministry is the failure to keep the appeal of the heroic before them. The salary question as a factor is a reproach to the Christianity of a man. He who will not enter the ministry but from the motive of making something out of it, has lost the very essence of the call of Christ. He has never heard Christ's call. This appeal is lost also in the Christian and in the congregation that does not respond to the missionary program of the Gospel. Ease in Zion, a beautiful church, an adequate income, all the equipment that could be desired without a missionary passion are the surest guarantees of a dwindling vision.

But heroic lives may be lived in favored circumstances. Comfort and ease need not remove the willingness to make one's self of no reputation. Rather these conditions afford the greater opportunity to serve. Unhampered by the material such men and women can go to greater lengths in self-forgetfulness. Many are doing so. The slums of our cities are exercising the wisdom of the finest brains and the affections of our noblest wealth. No, the increasing wealth of the church need not lessen the presence of heroism. When increasing comfort gains sway, then the great passions lose their vitality. The passing of the heroic lies in the absence of inspiring ideas, of generous enthusiasms, and of the courage of self-forgetfulness. These are the qualities kept alive by the missionary passion, when it has its right place in the heart of the church.

As for the regard in the church at the present time for home missions and the home missionary, I am frank to confess, it is not what it ought to be. It is regarded often as the training camp for young ministers, or the dump heap for the incapable and inefficient. The vision of its heroic splendor has been bedimmed. The need is to have the real glory and worth restored to its proper place in the mind of the church.

How shall it be done? Permit me to go back and recall the import of heroism. "Only when a man seizes the idea and meaning of some cause, and in the love and inspiration of that is able to forget himself and go to danger fearlessly because of his great desire and enthusiasm, only then is a man heroic." The significance is simply this, that the source of a valorous spirit lies in the estimate one forms of a cause. If it can obtain a just recognition of its value, it secures a loyal supporter. And when the ideal is of sufficient worth to win the supreme place in one's estimation then it wins an apostle. Christ numbers multitudes among his heroes, for the first place is his natural right.

In view of this fact then a restoration of the home mission field to its position of heroic appeal depends upon a new attitude of mind that must be created in the church. The church must awaken to its strategic importance, and to its rich possibilities for the investment of life. For this reason, there must be a new emphasis upon the principle of self-sacrifice in the doing of the will of God as the only source of Christian peace or progress. It is impossible to have rest and joy without completely sinking one's interests in the purpose of God. Neither is it possible for any advancement of the kingdom save only as we completely forget what we want, and know no mind but that of God in the redeeming of the world. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit." And in harmony with this deepest of all truths, are those that controlled the life of Jesus: "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted;" "He came not to be ministered unto, but to min-

ister; and to give his life a ransom for many." All of which received its perfect demonstration on the cross of Calvary. This note must be sounded as the core of Christian life. Without it all else is mere pretense. Not until denominations and congregations stress the Cross as the heart of Christianity will fathers and mothers rejoice to send their sons and daughters into the place of danger and conquest. Then it will be unpopular to seek the conspicuous or easy berth; then the field worth while will be the place God calls, no matter how inconspicuous or difficult.

The second need in the restoration of the heroic in home missions is to be met by an adequate presentation of the various situations that call for the investment of life. This will reveal the possibilities for life development. Seen with faith's perspective, small fields loom large with great futures. Just now fields may not present as fascinating or attractive appeals as some well established work. But we must not forget that the sowing of seed is a richer investment than the gathering of a harvest; the building of a foundation is more vital than the adding of any story, or the putting on of the capstone. Abraham went out not knowing whither he was going, but the venture with God made him the father of the faithful.

The conditions in our nation are changing rapidly. The work of the home missionary is doing likewise. The fields for pioneering are becoming fewer each year. The missionary statesman after the type of Sheldon Jackson, where they laid broad lines for the great domains, is passing into the intensive development of fields already established. The coming of the foreigner with his materialistic dreams is a most insidious foe to combat. The readjustment of Protestantism in many localities calls for men with vision clear enough, and heroism great enough to do some holy murdering. For there is need of men who will go into fields and work themselves out of a job by getting the situation, and then wisely make the most of it by giving up their plant and enterprise to a fewer number

of churches who may serve their community better. Then too the country is presenting a fine appeal for the home missionary. With hundreds of small churches passing out of existence every year, with the incoming of the tenantry, and the consequent decay of interest in country life, there is abundant opportunity for the initiative and holy boldness of the best men the church possesses. What the church needs is the facts from these fields. If their claims cannot win the respect and devotion of men by the candid statement of conditions then there is no possibility of arousing the heroic impulse. Any other effort would be the creation of a flame for which there would be no fuel to feed. But the home mission fields in our nation do make an appeal to the best in men.

The heroic will be restored to home missions when the strong men will heed the personal challenge. Any cause, no matter what it may be, must have men big enough to command attention before it will gain the hearing it deserves. This does not necessarily mean the big in reputation. But it does mean the men who have stable qualities of character, and without saying much, go quietly to work, and do things that impress the church. The foreign field has had big men to meet heroic situations; and the church could not but listen. They may not be as conspicuous, but the problems within the nation to-day—problems of readjustment as well as initiative—will require a firmer hand and bolder courage than the facing of a heathen mob, or braving the beast of the jungle. On the other hand the denominations must not forget to be fair. If the best men are challenged for the difficult situations, they ought to be sent with an adequate equipment for their work. There is no need in this day, when the church has all the money it desires, to ask any man to make an unnecessary sacrifice. In his struggle with the hosts of wickedness he will have enough sacrifice to make; and to inadequately supply him is to handicap the workman. To send a good man on a small salary to do a great work is folly. It is unnecessary. Then too the suggestion has been made that the churches es-

tablish the merit system for the home missionaries, that as the positions of responsibility in that department become vacant, they be filled with the men who have toiled in the ranks and proven that they know and can solve the problems. We simply mention it, not to discuss, but to give it for what it is worth in its appeal to strong men. When the church will do the fair thing, she will have more self-respect, as well as respect for the point or man she supports. It is for the spiritual welfare of denominations that they should do so.

We dare not presume for a moment that these suggestions would solve the problem. But we believe that if these endeavors are made in our congregations, and in our seminaries, there would be a new attitude toward home missions all over the church. They would come to the forefront. The church would be behind it solidly. And it would be dealt with in an adequate manner. Standards of heroism are changing. They are different from what they were in the days of chivalry. Then it was glorious to be bold in some outward venture of daring and courage; but now the heroic is seen in those who stand for moral ideals, and are brave in qualities of the soul. Men are manifesting a heroism of a finer, though less conspicuous quality. But the joy of it is none the less. The finest heroism is the enthusiasm that delights to serve and hide away behind a worth-while effort that helps men, and increases the appreciation of the glorious Gospel of the unimpeachable Son of God.

KANSAS CITY, Mo.

VI.

THE PRE-REFORMATION POPES.¹

GEO. S. BUTZ.

Mr. H. G. Wells, in his latest book *The Soul of a Bishop*, refers to a well-known psychological law—call it rather a fresh influx and increment of spiritual power—in the observation: “We spiritualize ourselves in seeking to spiritualize others.” “To spiritualize others”—let us amplify this and say, to spiritualise the world—to liberate men from the debasing thraldrom of their brute inheritance, to help them

“Arise and fly
The reeling Faun, the sensual feast,
Move upward, working out the beast,
And let the ape and tiger die,”—

and by spiritualising men to transform society and so establish the kingdom of God and his righteousness on the earth: is not this the will of God, the end for which Christ died and for the accomplishment of which he founded his Church, himself ever present in it and energizing through the Word, the Sac-

¹ The writer disclaims any intention to stress either the higher lights or the darker shades in these miniatures of the Popes at this critical period of papal history. The facts under review are based on the very best evidence obtainable, the authorities cited below and in the text. In speaking of the ‘poison of the Borgias,’ where the incriminating evidence is not clear and irrefragable, we have inclined to the side of charity. . . . Besides the older historians of the Papacy—Ranke, Langer, Gregorovius, the still valuable chapters in Milman’s *Latin Christianity* and the scholarly volumes of Prof. Lindsay and Dr. David Schaff on the Reformation; the readers of the REVIEW are referred to the more recent histories—those of Father Grigar, Dr. Mann, and, in particular, Dr. Pastor and Bishop Creighton. Then there are the indispensable works of Burckhardt, John Addington Symonds, and Ludwig Geiger, of Berlin, on the Italian Renaissance, for collateral reading.

raments, and the Spirit? Is not this the heaven-imposed and inescapable mission of the Church—to spiritualise and save—and should not this be the chief concern of those entrusted with its spiritual oversight and rule? If, as Cyprian says, *Ecclesia est in episcopo*, then none so responsible for the spiritualisation of the Church as its bishops—most responsible the sovereign pontiff, he who claims to be the accredited representative among men of the Bishop and Shepherd of souls, the vicegerent of Christ upon earth. Had the successors of Peter, in the times before the Reformation, been seriously intent upon the discharge of the spiritual function implicit in their church-wide bishopric, it must have reacted inevitably to their own spiritual advantage and have invested the papacy in the reverential regard of the faithful with a luminous halo. Then the demand, growing ever more insistent and ominous, swelling in volume and force, toward the close of the Middle Ages—the demand for a *Reformatio in capite et membris*—would not have been heard so persistently, would have been far less portentous; at all events, it would have been without menace to these pseudo apostles, and certainly not been so disastrous to papal prestige, to papal pretensions and claims. A more spiritual temper, apostolic zeal and holiness, might have gone far to avert revolution and schism and have saved to the Old Church some of her proudest possessions. Had but these Popes, in the meridian splendor of the Renaissance and in the heyday of their earthly felicity and power, had an eye single to the welfare of the Church and the spiritual interests of religion; had they been holy and unblamable in their lives, showing forth a good example unto all their flock; a pattern to all prelates and bishops in piety and godly living; had they been all this and done all this, they would have been bishops indeed, followers of the true Shepherd who giveth his life for the sheep—not hirelings and wolves, as were some of them, fleecing and scattering the folded flock of Christ, the pure and holy One, even that celestial ἀρχιποιμήν (1 Pet. 5. 4) whom in this terrestrial caravansary they pretended to represent.

But *did* they represent Him? Did they have the welfare of the Church at heart? Did they care for the spiritual interests of religion? Did they deny ungodliness and worldly lusts? Were their lives pure and saintly? What does a searching study of the literary sources and of the archaeological and artistic monuments of the period reveal? In evidence it is enough to cite Guicciardini's acutely analytical autobiographical memoirs, and his classic *Storia D'Italia*,² a masterpiece of scientific history, in which he gives a detailed picture of his country's sufferings and of the papal corruption that was incurable at this period of Renaissance decadence; then question such unimpeachable witnesses as Giovio and Bembo; examine such irrefutable testimony as the Diaries of Burchard, Infessura and Sanuto afford; taken together they convincingly disclose the private habits, favorite pastimes and preoccupations of these quite mundane, anything but spiritually minded, Pontiffs. The sumptuous books and elegantly written, exquisitely illuminated manuscripts crowding their library shelves and enriching their cabinets, the articles of *virtu* of every imaginable kind,

" Those golden palaces, those gorgeous halles,
With fourniture superflouslie fair,"*

the pictorial and architectural glories of Rome, tell the story of their luxurious tastes, their intellectual and æsthetic interests. Recent historians, Catholic as well as Protestant—not, of course, the controversial sort, but those that are impartial and dispassionate—basing their judgment on a more critical investigation of contemporary records and documents, agree that with few exceptions these Pontiffs were estranged from apostolic humility and zeal and that they were far from being sacrosanct. Savor of holiness there was little or none. What remained? The ancient solemn rites were punctiliously performed, the stately ceremonials of religion were celebrated with due pomp and circumstance, as

² Rosini's edition, Pisa, 1819. 10 volumes.

* *The Tragedy of Darius*, Wm. Alexander, 1603.

of yore. All the gorgeous trappings of Sacerdotalism continued to dazzle the eye, the esoteric symbols of their exalted office were there—now no longer impressive or convincing. Tunicle, dalmatic, chasuble—the pectoral cross, sandals, gloves—the triple crown and ring, the very pastoral staff—these all had become meaningless, contemptible. The anointed servants of the Lord, the high priests of Christendom, who arrayed their persons in these magnificent vestments and bore the sacred insignia of a dignity the most sublime on earth, flaunted their irreligion in the eyes of the world. Their processions and their solemnities had come to be an empty spectacle, a sorry masquerade, a profane and vainglorious show, deceiving no one. Where will we look for a parallel? We turn from papal to imperial Rome. We see the sacred fire *ērūptus* carried in ceremonial solemnity in the forefront of a Caligula, a Nero, a Commodus, a Heliogabalus, and it strikes us that these monsters, these demoniac counterfeits of men who disdained the purple, are the glaring antitheses and inversions of that which the titular Augustus was by that old Roman world supposed to be—a *divus*, a god, in his office sacred and immortal: out of which grew his sacrosanct dignity as Pontifex Maximus of the Roman state religion. No matter how vile and degraded in character, Divus and Pontifex Maximus Cæsar continued to be.* So the Pontifex Maximus of Catholic Christendom was a *sacred* person—at any rate, so viewed by any mediæval Christian of deep feeling: the depositary of superhuman power, standing above all human control, sharing in the attributes of supernatural beings, and invested by the minds of the faithful with some dim and undefined relation to the sanctities of the unseen world. But see how this sublime conception—already distant and remote—and what wonder after the vicissitudes, the almost utter spiritual prostration, of the papal Exile and Schism—now “vanished into air, into thin air,” leaving “not a rack behind.” The mediæval idea of the divine supremacy and inherent sanctity of the papal office and

* From Augustus to Gratian (382 A. D.).

character—never more than an ideal, to be sure, often defaced and marred, and quite eclipsed and blackened by the monstrous Pornocracy of the tenth century—was completely obliterated by the vice and incompetence of the worst of the Renaissance Popes.³ The incredible turpitude, the moral worthlessness of these men—Paul, Sixtus, Innocent, Alexander, Leo—shocked even the degenerate Romans. Their paganism, their greed, their costly pomps and pageants, the lush luxuriance of their pampered lives, outraged the moral sense of northern Europe and hastened the Reformation.

A reformation of the Church *in capite et membris*? the process of purgation and renewal to begin at the head? at Rome? with the Sovereign Pontiff? What an absurdity! They made themselves merry over this thing. It provoked their unquenchable laughter.* O fatuous and blind! *Quos dii volunt perdere prius dementant.* With such men directing the helm, what hope of escape from the rock and the whirlpool had the venerable Church of the ages, the ancient weather-beaten galleon, now laboring heavily in a rough sea? What chance of outriding the coming storm? Their course lay between the rock of a revived paganism,

³ The vice and incompetence of Paul II, Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, and Leo X, were largely responsible for the catastrophic movement which shook to its foundation the Papal tradition which was only saved from total subversion by the Counter Reformation, forced on the Papacy by stern and exacting pressure, the disruption of Christendom, and the destructive criticism of Humanists and Reformers. These degenerate Pontiffs were the children of the pagan renascence and sank to the level of their age. If these men succumbed to the influence of their environment, the moral superiority of their successors in the chair of Peter during the last four hundred years has redeemed the Papal institution from the aspersions of its enemies and perpetuated the religious dictatorship of a great spiritual autocracy over the souls of millions even in Protestant lands, with a glory undimmed and a power undiminished by the revolutionary movements of the nineteenth century, initiated by Voltaire and Rousseau and Mirabeau, fatal as these convulsions have been to the political theory of Papal Rome.

* Quenched now like the 'inextinguishable laughter' of the Olympians.

"Und längst ist erloschen
Das unauslöschliche Göttergelächter."
Heine: *Die Götter Griechenlands.*

shrouded in purple mists, invested with a deceptive glamor, and the whirlpool of revolution: as yet they felt not the tug of the cross currents running strongly there ahead of them: it required a skill and a strength not theirs to steer a safe course between this Scylla and that Charybdis. It was the Renaissance noonday, the skies were never so sunny and tranquil: it was the lull before the tempest, what else but the brooding calm, the golden haleyon forerunning the blackness of storm?

These men were blind to the teachings of history. Revolutionary spirits of an earlier day, insurgents and idealists like Arnold of Brescia, Peter de Bruys, Cola di Rienzi—‘what are agitators like these but a vexation of spirit, discords in the harmony of the papal lute? It is our business to silence with the stern voice of authority these upstart voices, to suppress these noisy declaimers and disturbers of ecclesiastical somnolence and repose.’ Strange religious associations like the Beghards, Flagellants, Fraticelli, Friends of God, whose deep piety and fervid religious sense revolted against the purely objective religion of the Church and voiced a protest against the corruption in high places and in the seats of authority, could only awaken in these Sybaritic natures goodnatured pity or lofty contempt. Ecclesiastical reform, even when pressed by influential and loyal Churchmen like John of Paris, Pierre D’ailly and Gerson, seemed to them an impertinence, if not a matter of jest. Still worse, they were fatally short-sighted to the ominous meaning of those great religious movements, in the not so distant past, led by John Wyclif, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague. ‘Down with such pestilent fellows. Curse us these dour enthusiasts. Away with them. Their bodies to the flames. Their ashes to the winds. So should Popes and Councils ever deal with heretics and schismatics.’ Ah, but the soul! Could they immolate *that*? We know how the spirit of these men descended upon a martyr of a later day and declared itself in a memorable utterance. His life blood ebbing away on the field of battle, in the throes of mortal agony, the immortal part of him overcoming the sharpness of death and conscious of ultimate victory, the

Reformed proto-martyr uttered those inspired words full of quietness and assurance forever: "They may kill the body, but they cannot kill the soul." And so the spirit of Wyclif and Huss lived on—on to the Reformation, and lives to-day—expressing itself in popular movements like that of the Lollards in England and the Hussite wars in Bohemia. But none of these reform movements, ecclesiastical, religious, popular, could teach these purblind souls anything. No, not even when the hoary institution they represented, that had outlived the wreck of imperial Rome, that had seen the rise and fall of kingdoms, and that had crowned and discrowned emperors and kings, was on the eve of a great convulsion. For the time was ripe for the mightiest outbreak the Christian centuries had seen against the spiritual despotism of Rome. The insensate folly, the carnal obsession of the men into whose hands had been given the scepter of spiritual rule and authority in western Europe had so darkened their vision and obscured their understanding that they could not discern the storm signals on the distant horizon.

Blind alike to the teachings of history and to the signs of the times in which they lived—those *semina rerum* perceived by philosophers, "the first symptoms of change," in the fluent idiom of Thomas De Quincey, "singing in the upper air like a coming storm"—they were deaf also to the prophetic voices of the past and those sounding in their ears. Deaf to that *living* voice uplifted there in beautiful Florence, entreating, thundering—now from the pulpit of San Marco, now beneath the marble dome of the great cathedral. It spoke of impending judgment. Alexander was incredulous, as was Leo in the day of his full-blown pride and power. They would not believe though one should rise from the dead. In the obscurity of the Erfurt cloister in the far Saxon land, and up yonder amid the ice peaks of Switzerland, God was training his servants in silence. Out of the North voices soon would cry aloud for liberty and freedom from a bondage become intolerable—be caught up by other voices and still others and so reverberate to the ends of the earth and to "the last syllable of

recorded time." Yet none of these voices could then penetrate to the heart and conscience of papal Rome. Contrast these protagonists of light and darkness—Savonarola and Alexander, Luther and Leo. The richly jewelled, regally appareled, delicately perfumed heirs of the poor peasant and fisherman heeded not the warning of these pious and austere monks, Dominican and Augustinian, whom they condemned and despised. Could any prophet of old time, *redivivus* in the new, any messenger sent from God to proclaim righteousness and judgment, move these men? No Prophet of Fire witnessing for the true God against the pagan Pantheon, no Daniel interpreting the awful writing on the wall, no Baptist preaching repentance and the advent of the Judge—not Savonarola threatening retributive woe and gathering wrath, nor Luther defying tyranny in the defence of the sacred and indefeasible rights of conscience, nor Zwingli appealing to the holy oracles of God against idolatrous beliefs and practices and the corrupting influences of Rome—none of those prophets of the old time could have succeeded any better than these messengers of the new to rouse them from their deep moral syncope, their profound spiritual torpor, and send them on their knees. Neither the heart-shattering terrors of the *Dies Irae*, nor the freezing horrors of the mediæval *Inferno* as imaged in "the solemn march of Dante's lines,"⁴ could affright or appal these Popes. What cared they for these imaginary terrors, these figments and hallucinations of a sick ascetic brain? What had they to do with the ascetic ideals of Savonarola and the whole monastic world? Ascetic ideals, forsooth! They mocked at them. Their conduct was not modelled on the Pattern Life as exhibited either in the pages of the New Testament or as held up for their contemplation in the "De Imitatione Christi" of Thomas à Kempis. They were as far removed from the radiant beauty and benignant goodness of that Life as the poles are removed from each other, let us say rather, as high as the heavens are above the earth. They did

⁴ Mahaffy, *What have the Greeks done for the Modern World*, Putnam, 1909.

not covet for themselves the halo encircling the pictured saints in their oratories and on their palace walls. The aureole and the nimbus were artistically beautiful and effective in the frescoes of Fra Angelico and Perugino and the masters of sacred painting. They were proper pictorial embellishments and good when viewed as objects of æsthetic contemplation. But as for themselves, they had no burning desire to emulate saintly virtues or to be limned with a glory streaming from their persons or with a golden disc about their heads. The vigils and the fastings which that shining splendor about the attenuated figures of the saints and the glowing sphere around their heads typified; the midnight orisons and the penitential sorrow which they symbolised; the ministries of love and mercy which they bespoke; the passionate striving after something akin to angelic purity, and the unrelenting effort to attain the joy and the peace of the beatified, which this pictured "radiancy of glory" announced as the heaven-appointed path to the bliss of Paradise: these endless kneelings on the cold stones of darkened chapels, these macerations and mortifications of the flesh, these ministries of Christly charity and these pure saintly aspirations had nothing of divine attractiveness for these apostates and reversions from the glorious company of the Apostles, these aesthetes who stood forth as the apotheosis of the neo-paganism of their age.

In these *bons vivants* and gay voluptuaries we see the epicureanism of the age, reclining at the rich banquet of the senses, with perfumed locks, brows grape-enwreathed, and lips stained with the potent wine of life; anon whirling on giddy feet into life's bacchanalian revel; and at last swooning away into moral insensibility. A panegyric on the enjoyments of this mundane life, an epithalamium in honor of the nuptials of Man and the World, his beauteous bride, were more in harmony with their sentiment than threnodies and doleful chants at the obsequies of the senses, and expressed their revulsion of feeling against ascetic ideals.

To this, then, had the successors of Peter come. They cared not for men's souls, their lives were carnal and unholy, they

had despiritualised themselves. What wonder their voice had lost the authentic note of authority! The authentic note of authority. And what is that? The divinity that speaks out of a pure and holy life. It inspires reverence and compels obedience. This is what impresses us more than aught else in Rubens' great canvas emblematic of the power of the Church—that memorable scene where the saintly Ambrose refuses Theodosius admission to his cathedral-church at Milan until he has done penance for his ruthless massacre of some Thessalonican Christians. And he compels obedience. What is it that awes the august emperor into submission? The *beauty of holiness*, the saintliness of the bishop's life. His episcopal office was ennobled, his priestly authority reënforced and exalted, by the persuasive power, the supernal authority of a holy life: authentic, not spurious; inspiring awe and moving to obeisance. In *this* resides the power of the keys. It was to men who embodied this ideal that the Head of the Church committed authority and rule. Look again at the majestic figures confronting each other there under the massive arched portals in the Flemish master's impressive picture,⁵ so rich in coloring, virile in conception, vigorous in execution. Behold them, Emperor and Bishop, the one the incarnation of the temporal power, the other of the spiritual; the spiritual triumphant; "imperial Caesar" humbling himself, earthly pride and puissance in the person of this august Dominus Mundi bowing down before the compelling power of goodness, the divine authority vested and inhering in holiness of life.

Holiness of life. This is the thing we have been all along insisting on as the only divine chrism legitimatising and sanctioning in the sight of heaven episcopal rule and authority, or, indeed, the bearing of any office whatsoever in the Church militant. Did the Popes of the Prereformation or Renaissance period possess it? If not, why not? A partial answer to this interrogation has been given. We proceed to fill out the sketch

⁵ In the Belvedere, Vienna.

as fully as we may, having prepared the ground and outlined the salient features and the necessary contrasts here and there; and then having renewed our previous impressions by a fresh glance at these characters we shall see at least one or two of the many reasons why in ‘the course of human events’—which is, after all, only a periphrasis for ‘the providence of God’—a Reformation of the Church, including the movement within the bosom of Catholicism itself known as the Catholic Reaction, was so necessary.

Holiness of life, we reiterate, was not the ideal of the Renaissance Popes. Consequently holiness of life was not what the Christian world at this time saw enthroned in the chair of Peter. Not apostolic humility, apostolic zeal and holiness, but the person of Antichrist rather, was the spectacle there presented before the gaze of Christendom.

For the Christian ideal the successors of Peter substituted the ideals of Paganism, and heathen ideals speedily paganised the Papacy. Between the lofty spiritual claims of these Popes and the pagan demeanor of their lives there was a shocking contradiction.

They cared more for pagan literature, for magnificent display, for marble halls, galleries and chapels filled with statues and paintings, than for the welfare of the Church and the spiritual interests of religion. They thought only of self-aggrandisement, the subjugation of the Papal States, the consolidation of their temporal power. It was their supreme ambition to rule as Italian despots, to unite in themselves the absolutism of political autocrats with the spiritual supremacy of a sovereign pontiff—an ambition which came nigh ending in the complete secularisation of the See of Rome. The acquisition and accumulation of money for the furtherance of their worldly schemes was effected by simony, by the infamous traffic in indulgences, and in the case of the worst of the Popes, at least, by pardons for murder and manslaughter, and by the secret destruction of those whose inheritance they coveted. This spiritual lapse or obscuration of the Papacy extends over

a period of seventy years, from 1464 to 1534, when the Counter Reformation purged it of the evils which had threatened its utter ruin.

Nicholas the Fifth in 1447 commenced the work of building up the secular power of the Roman pontiffs, brought to a ruinous pass by the "Babylonian Captivity" when the Popes resided at Avignon—with which began the devolution of the Papacy—and by the Great Schism of the West. What Nicholas began "was carried on amid crimes, anarchy, and bloodshed by successive Popes of the Renaissance until at last the troops of Frundsberg paved the way in 1527 for the Jesuits of Loyola."

When Martin V ended the Great Schism and in 1421 brought back the pontifical seat to Rome, he found it "little more than a heap of ruins." To such desolation had the city been brought by the thousand shocks of war and by the hand of the spoiler within and without, but chiefly by the internecine strife of the great rival houses of the Colonna and the Orsini. Martin V was a Roman by birth, and on his return commenced rebuilding the city. His successor, Eugenius IV, continued the renovation of imperial and papal Rome. To Nicholas V, however, belongs the credit of being the Restorer of the City, the Builder of Modern Rome. Successive Popes, preëminent among them Julius II, Leo X, and Sixtus V, simply advanced the work so splendidly begun by Nicholas V.

The ruling passions of this great Pontiff were books and buildings. When he was yet the poor, simple monk, Thomas of Sarzano, his irresistible craving for books involved him deeply in debt, from which the timely generosity of his friends alone availed to extricate him. This overmastering love for books and his passion for fine buildings the copious revenues and emoluments of the Papal See enabled him amply to gratify. It was his soaring ambition to make Rome once more the centre of everything great and noble in the world, the cynosure of the nations, the home of art and letters, as well as the religious metropolis of Christendom.

Who shall say that Art has not made the hoary city, as it appeared in the glowing vision of Nicholas, once more the wonder and the glory and the admiration of the whole earth? Who shall deny that he had a passion to build—"murare"? Walls, towers, citadels, churches, palaces, some of them new, some of them restorations of what had become dilapidated or fallen, sprang up as if by magic on every hand. Indeed, the number and variety of his building operations, not only in the city but throughout Italy, is bewildering. The architectural magnificence of Rome, characterised by extreme solidity and sumptuousness—her glorious palaces, the splendor and majesty of her churches that astonish the imagination and overawe the soul, may be traced to the building activity or to the influence of Nicholas the Fifth. The erection of those vast and splendid edifices which render the eternal city glorious as a bride and call up the beautiful image of her classic grandeur, has been due to the magnificent policy of this art loving Pontiff, who in the execution of his ambitious architectural projects expended untold wealth, and expended it with the liberal prodigality of a Roman Imperator showering largesses upon an applauding populace. "Rome was restored, adorned, and enlightened," says Gibbon, "by the peaceful reign of Nicholas the Fifth."

In the midst of these great building operations, the claims of his beloved books were not forgotten. Scholars and literature came in for an equal share of his attention with architects and stone-masons. He was the most munificent patron of letters in all Italy. The scholars of Italy and Greece flocked to his court and found an enthusiastic reception. He kept an army of "Scrittori" and "Copysti" constantly occupied in transcribing manuscripts, while he employed eminent literati in translating for the enrichment of the West all that had survived of the literature of Athens and Alexandria. His remuneration of all these services was beyond all precedent liberal.

His predecessor, Eugenius IV, had so far outgrown the

ancient prejudice of Churchmen against profane literature that he scrupled not to encourage classical studies. Still, he was but a faint adumbration of the later Renaissance Popes in respect of openmindedness and literary patronage. It was a far cry from the ascetic Gregory the First, who would destroy every vestige of "heathen letters," to the epicurean Leo the Tenth, who steeped his mind in pagan literature and was a pagan at heart.

Nicholas the Fifth, with his great enthusiasm for classic literature, his munificent patronage of scholars and his zeal to render Rome the most splendid city in Christendom, commands our respect and challenges our admiration. He was succeeded in the pontifical chair by Calixtus the Third. His reign was uneventful.

Pius the Second, who followed, had long been known in courtly circles and to the European world of culture as the distinguished diplomatist, traveller and humanist, Aneas Sylvius Piccolimini. His devotion to the cause of letters was that of a passionate lover to his mistress. His ardent love for learning appears in a beautiful epistle to his nephew, in which he exhorts the gay, pleasure-loving youth to diligent study: "Non enim Lucifer aut Hesperus tam pulcher est quam sapientia studiis acquiritur litterarum" (Ep. Lib. 1. 4). Like the first Gregory when elevated to the papal throne, like Thomas à Becket when raised to the See of Canterbury, Aneas Sylvius, when he had mounted the chair of St. Peter as Pope Pius the Second, greatly astonished his friends, and disappointed the humanists among them, by his whole-hearted pious zeal in the cause of Holy Church. The *ci devant* free-thinking, worldly-minded Humanist all at once became an earnest serious-browed Churchman after the type of Leo the Great and Hildebrand. Probably the keenest disappointment of his life was his failure to launch the crusade he so fervently advocated against the ancient enemies of the faith. The Italians accorded but a cold reception to his passionate propaganda. He appealed, insisted, threatened—desired "the bell of the Turks"

to be rung every morning throughout Christendom and untiringly sought to arm a new crusade against the powerful military organisation of the Ottomans, whose aggressions were daily becoming more bold and threatening, if not indeed a menace to western Europe. He could not believe that the Theocratic Era of the Church, the passionately religious age of Urban and Innocent, had gone by long since, never to return. The militant hosts of the "most Christian Kings" of the West were now pitted against each other in the behest of ignoble worldly ambitions.

Pius the Second is "the last Pope of the Renaissance period whom we can regard with real respect. Those who follow sacrificed the interests of Christendom to family ambition, secured their sovereignty at the price of discord in Italy, and played the part of Antichrist upon the theater of Europe." Under these Popes, Rome became a den of robbers, the lair of assassins, a brothel, what Lorenzo de Medici described as "a sink of all the vices." The worldliness of these Popes, their vaulting ambition, their nepotism, their abominable vices and cynical wickedness, outraged and shocked the conscience of northern Europe and hastened the Reformation. Unappalled by the spectacle of a religious revolution proceeding in Germany, undeterred by the political convulsions and impending ruin of Italy, these apparitions from the pit continued to "play their fantastic tricks before high heaven."

The pomp-loving Paul the Second was the first of these unworthy wearers of the papal tiara. Here was a Holy Father extremely vain of his handsome person, delighting in gorgeous pageants, an art connoisseur, squandering the revenues of the Church and the pious gifts of the faithful on magnificent collections of gems, cameos and precious stones, filling his cabinets with "rare treasures of antiquity and costly masterpieces of Italian and Flemish goldsmiths." He was avaricious, luxurious, sensual. He incurred the bitter hatred of the humanists in consequence of his persecution of the platonists.

"He died of apoplexy in 1471, alone and suddenly, after supping on two huge watermelons, *duos prægrandes pepones*."

The terrible Sixtus the Fourth, the first of the "nipoti," was guilty of nameless vices, and of crimes too revolting to register. After lavishing wealth with reckless prodigality upon his favorite son, he undertook to carve out of the fertile and beautiful Romagna a principality for his nephew, Girolamo Riario. In the execution of this enterprise he did not scruple to plunge the Italian states into warfare, marked in its course by frightful scenes of bloodshed, revolutions, proscriptions, assassinations, and sacrilege, *e. g.*, the Conspiracy of the Pazzi, in which Giuliano de Medici was slain before the high altar of the cathedral at Florence. Modesty bids us draw a veil over the abominations of this Pope—his shameless sale of indulgences, his corn monopolies, his brigandage, his extravagant profligacy, the libertinism, debaucheries, and sensual indulgences of all sorts in which he wallowed. An exasperated witness of his enormities cries: "Our churches, priests, altars, sacred rites, our prayers, our heaven, our very God are purchasable." Sixtus died of rage in 1484, because the Italian Powers, tired of slashing at each others' throats in the interests of the Pope's favorite, at last were sane enough to conclude peace.

Innocent the Eighth succeeded Sixtus the Fourth. He enjoys the distinction of having been the first Pope unblushingly to acknowledge his children. He married his son Franceschetto to Maddelena, the daughter of Lorenzo the Magnificent. This led to the bestowal of a cardinal's hat upon Lorenzo's son Giovanni, a lad of thirteen years, the future Leo X. In this way was established the Medicean interest in the Papacy. In corruption Innocent went beyond Sixtus. He established a bank at Rome for the sale of pardons. To fill his coffers he caused travellers, pilgrims, and ambassadors to Rome to be murdered and stripped by bands of hired assassins and brigands. When the old wolf lay a-dying, a Jewish doctor proposed to revive him by the transfusion of youthful blood into

his torpid veins. "Three boys throbbing with the elixir of youth were sacrificed in vain."

And now the pontifical robes were donned by a veritable monster, Alexander the Sixth,⁶ a Caliban in moral deformity,

"Which any print of goodness will not take,
Being capable of all ill."

At the conclave of cardinals convoked for the election of the new Pope, bribery was openly resorted to and votes were bought and sold with the most shameless effrontery. The Borgias were Spaniards. The elevation of his family to power and wealth was the consuming ambition of Alexander VI. Ranke says: "How the pope would proceed, in regard to the marriages, endowments and advance of his children, became a question affecting the politics of Europe." The rapacity of these human harpies was illimitable. A contemporary writes: "Ten papacies would not suffice to satiate the greed of all this kindred." Alexander is perhaps the very worst character in all history. "To describe him as the Genius of Evil, whose sensualities, as unrestrained as Nero's, were relieved against the background of flame and smoke which Christianity had raised for fleshly sins, is justifiable," says John Addington Symonds. "His spiritual tyranny, that arrogated Jus, by right of which he claimed the hemisphere revealed by Christopher Columbus and imposed upon the press of Europe the censure of the Church of Rome, was rendered ten times more monstrous by the glare reflected on it from the unquenched furnace of a godless life. The universal conscience of Christendom is revolted by those unnameable delights, orgies of blood and festivals of lust, which were enjoyed in the plenitude of his green and vigorous old age by this versatile diplomatist and subtle priest, who controlled the councils of Kings, and who chanted the sacramental service for a listening world on Easter

⁶ Bishop Creighton's *History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome* (six vols., 2d ed., 1897) is rather too indulgent to Alexander and needs supplementing by the documents in Pastor (*History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*. Eng. trans., 1891, etc.).

Day. And now in the pontificate of Alexander that memorable scene presented to the nations of the modern world a pageant of Antichrist and Antiphysis—the negation of the Gospel and of nature: a glaring spectacle of discord between humanity as it aspires to be at its best, and humanity as it is at its worst; a tragi-comedy composed by some infernal Aristophanes, in which the servant of servants, the anointed of the Lord, played the chief part." *Cui viget nihil simile aut secundum!* So much for the father. Ranke describes the son Cesare Borgia in a few pregnant words when he calls him "a virtuoso in crime." It is not easy to decide which of the two, father or son, surpassed the other in sheer wickedness. Perhaps we might say that they were both absolutely wicked. There is, indeed, hardly a crime of which they were not guilty—simony, sacrilege, murder, the most horrible cruelties, lust the most monstrous, sensualities the most loathsome; any of these were, singly, enough to fill up the measure of their iniquities. No wonder these infamous creatures inspired such boundless fear and hatred in the day of their power. No wonder that succeeding centuries have regarded them with profound abhorrence and execration. Grave and accepted historians used to assert that both fell victims to the poison mingled with the wine intended for a rich cardinal, Adriano da Corneto, whose wealth they coveted. Latter-day historians will agree (with Sir Roger de Coverley) that "there is something to be said on both sides." Perhaps it is best to err on the side of liberality by doubting the story. "Modern history is content with the known malaria of an autumn night."⁷ Cæsar recovered from his deathly illness. Alexander died, "a black and swollen mass, hideous to contemplate." Guicciardini, the Florentine historian, relates how "all Rome ran with indescribable gladness to view the corpse. Men could not satiate their eyes with feeding on the carcass of the serpent, who, by his unbounded ambition and pestiferous perfidy, by every demonstration of horrible cruelty, monstrous lust, and un-

⁷ *Crises in the History of the Papacy*, Ch. XII, "Alexander VI, the Borgia Pope," Jos. McCabe, 1916.

heard of avarice, selling without distinction things sacred and profane, had filled the world with venom."

After the brief rule of Paul the Third, Julius the Second⁸ (1503–1513), called the "Savior of the Papacy," succeeds. A martial figure is this Giuliano della Rovera. Free from the disgusting vices and shameless traffic in sacred things which had so long disgraced the chair of St. Peter, war and conquest was the dominant passion of this masterful old Pontiff. With the commencement of his reign simony and nepotism all but cease. No more are cardinals created on payment of enormous sums of money. Julius makes wars—even takes the field in mid-winter at the head of his armies, wins victories, consolidates the patrimony of Peter; employs the greatest architects, sculptors, and painters of the age in the creation of magnificent works of genius. But in all these splendid triumphs of war and peace he had an eye single to the glory of the Church, *ad majorem ecclesiae gloriam*. There can be no doubt that "Julius was one of the greatest figures of the Renaissance. He stamped the century with the impress of his powerful personality. It is to him we owe the most splendid of Michael Angelo's and Raphael's masterpieces. The Basilica of St. Peter's was his thought." So great was his enthusiasm for antique sculpture that when the Laocoön was discovered in the baths of Titus he set all the bells of Rome a-ringing. We admire this doughty, imperious-tempered champion of papal rights not so much for the qualities which distinguished him as a warrior and politician as for his liberal patronage of the fine arts and for those notable affinities of soul which allied him to the titanic genius and austere spirit of Michael Angelo. In adjudging and appraising the merits and demerits of the Renaissance Popes, where there is so little that we can honestly commend, and while their moral qualities repel or revolt us, yet we must not boorishly withhold—nay, we gladly accord them—the high meed of praise they undoubtedly deserve for the great services rendered by them to

⁸ M. Broseh, *Papst Julius II*, 1878.

the cause of polite letters and the fine arts, which found in the worst as well as in the best of them such magnificent patrons.

With the accession of Leo the Tenth, the Florentine Casa Medici was lifted to the pinnacle of earthly power and glory. The advancement of the Medicean interests in the peninsula and in the cabinets of Europe was now the thing of chief moment. They became the predominant influence in Italian polities. Chains were being forged destined to drag unhappy Florence at the triumphal car of the Medici.

Leo the Tenth⁹ (1513–1520) was a pagan at heart. The supreme embodiment of the refined intellectualism, the superficial polish, luxurious elegance, and cheerful epicurean sensualism of the Renaissance noonday—such was Leo the Tenth. This period of pagan renascence exactly suited the quality of his temper. He was not one of those unfortunates who laments having been “born out of due time.” He came upon the scene, had he been consulted, just at that brilliant era of European history when he would have wished to come—just “at the right time”—to his own immense gratification. And so we may not inaptly apply to him the self-gratulatory, complacent saying of Ovid,

Prisca juvent alios: ego me nunc denique natum
Gratulor. Haec aetas moribus apta meis.

The late Leslie Stephen in his fine essay on Shakespeare speaks of the great Elizabethan dramatists as illustrations of “the large and tolerant acceptance of human nature.” Never was there a more compromising example of this frank acceptance of human nature than Leo the Tenth. He was a Humanist to the last drop of his blood and the very last cell of his brain. The paradox of Christendom, the contradiction of the Gospel, in him was manifested the total negation of the Christian spirit and the complete assertion of the pagan temper: in him, the high priest of Christianity, the successor of St. Peter, the representative of Christ upon earth. He repre-

⁹ H. M. Vaughan (*The Medici Popes*, 1908) should be read in connection with Rosecoe's flattering *Life and Pontificate of Leo X.*

sents, more than any other man of his day, the triumph of classical culture over ecclesiastical tradition, the intellectual victory of Greek and Roman ideals achieved over the lofty moral and spiritual ideals of the Christian religion.

Julius, the warrior and politician, had said: "If we are not ourselves pious, why should we prevent other people from being so!" Leo, the intellectual sensualist, when elevated to the summit of earthly felicity, said: "Let us enjoy the papacy since God has given it us!" And enjoy it he did. Not, it is true, after the manner of Sixtus and Innocent and Alexander, whose debasing sensuality he despised—although not free himself from clandestine rites of an unhallowed nature deep in the recesses of his palace—but chiefly in the enjoyment of intellectual pleasures. In the enjoyment of the literary and artistic society of Rome, of which his court became the brilliant centre; surrounded by painters, architects, sculptors, and goldsmiths; by poets, musicians, improvisatori, and scholars; in fishing, hawking, and hunting; in festivities, amusements, and theaters—so passed merrily the gay, corrupt life of Leo the Tenth. "Let us enjoy the papacy since God has given it us!" The remark furnishes the keynote to his reign. The Augustus of an age of unparalleled magnificence, the opulent, the lordly, the indolent Leo found more pleasure in the illustrious company of poets, artists, musicians, and scholars, than in the society of priests and theologians. For the sacerdotal duties of his exalted office and for the welfare of the Church he cared not at all. To his sumptuous banquets crowded the votaries of Venus, Priapus and Bacchus, who filled the papal palace with the sound of their revels. Borne aloft in his chair like a demigod amid the gorgeous pageantry of semi-pagan festivals and processions, he loved to sun himself in the broad blaze of admiring applause and to receive the adulations of cardinals and prince-bishops. Emperors lived in no such pomp and regal state as this refined voluptuary, this luxurious pagan who gave his name to the golden age of Renaissance art and letters. Never had art and letters a more appreciative

patron. Never had poets, scholars, men of genious found in any one a Mæcenas more extravagantly munificent. No wonder they as extravagantly praised him! But praise and extol their magnificent patron as they might, all Europe rang with the story of the blasphemies and abominations daily witnessed in the city of the Apostles. "Amid crowds of cardinals in hunting dress, dances of half-naked girls, and masques of Carnival Bacchantes, moved pilgrims from the North with wide, astonished, woeful eyes—disciples of Luther, in whose soul, as in a scabbard, lay sheathed the sword of the Spirit, ready to flash forth and smite."

In the gratification of his boundless æsthetic sensuality Leo denied himself nothing. The mines of Golconda would not have sufficed for the reckless extravagance of his expenditures. His brokers and hawkers of indulgences scattered over Europe could not get gold fast enough to supply his lavish prodigality. The provident Julius had left 700,000 ducats in the castle of San Angelo. The spendthrift Leo died leaving the very jewels of his tiara in pawn.

The heathen tone of the papal court is apparent in the tacit adhesion to the Aristotelian philosophy. Its chief exponent, Pomponatius, the most distinguished philosopher of the day, arrived at the blasphemous conclusion: "If the lawgiver declared the soul immortal he had done so without troubling himself about the truth." For "the Holy Ghost" Cardinal Bembo substituted "the breath of the heavenly zephyr." Instead of the expression "forgive us our debts," he would write, "to bend the manes and the sovereign gods." And for "Christ the Son of God," "Minerva sprung from the head of Jupiter."

The principles of Christianity were openly questioned. A church dignitary writes, "One passes no longer for a man of cultivation, unless one put forth heterodox opinions regarding the Christian faith." "At court the ordinances of the Catholic Church were made subjects of jest; the mysteries of faith had become matter of derision." Leo himself doubted the truth of the gospel story. He laughingly remarked:*

* Even if this remark is a myth, his life proclaimed his infidelity.

world knows how profitable this fable of Christ has been to us."

When the Church, in the person of her official representatives and highest dignitaries, was invaded by this spirit of scepticism, this heathen tone, this wave of neopaganism, she became indifferent to laxity of morals, while she remained bitterly intolerant of transalpine heterodoxy. Preoccupied with aesthetic culture, or celebrating the Saturnalia of the flesh, the Renaissance Popes regarded with complacency, if not with delighted approval, obscene books like Poggio's "Facetiae," Beccadelli's "Hermaphroditus," and La Casa's "Capitolo del Forno." But not a whit did they abate their zeal for dogmatic orthodoxy, and whilst themselves the greatest enemies of Christendom, they were ever ready to fulminate anathemas and bulls against reformers like Savonarola and Luther. It was the irreligion and abominations of Rome that had so shocked the religious sensibilities of Luther when he visited the "holy city" as a monk on business for his Order. And it was the scandalous huckstering of indulgences by Tetzel, the monger of Leo the Tenth's spiritual wares in Germany, that became the external occasion of Luther's ninety-five theses with which he began his attack upon Rome.

Concern for religion Leo had none. Destitute of moral earnestness, he lived untroubled by the corruptions of the Church, and regarded with amusement what it pleased him to call a mere quarrel of German monks, a *tempestas in matula*. Had he been able to read the signs of the times, could he have deciphered the Sibylline characters on the church door at Wittenberg, he would have recognised the Reformation in its incipient stage, Europe on the eve of a great religious revolution, the time-worn Roman Colossus tottering to a fall. He lived like a pagan and he died an infidel, refusing to the last to receive the Catholic sacrament of extreme unction. By the paganism of his life and by his extravagant expenditures, Leo the Tenth directly contributed toward the stupendous cataclysm which rent Europe in twain.

VII.

THE POLITICAL RESULTS OF THE REFORMATION.

E. WILBUR KRIEBEL.

The political results of the Reformation stand out very clearly in the two centuries following that great event; but when we come down to the very recent political developments, we are confronted with the difficult task of separating the proximate or direct from the remote or indirect results of the Reformation. It is probably true that many of our modern political institutions would never have come into existence, unless the Reformation with its new liberty had given the opportunity for their birth; but the spirit in some of these movements is distinctly alien to that of the Reformers, and they would indignantly repudiate their responsibility for such ideas. The Reformation may have been the occasion, but it was not the proximate cause of these political systems. Therefore we do not expect to have unanimity of opinion as to what are the direct political results of the Reformation; all we can hope to do is to show the immediate political results in the succeeding century or two—from these manifestations, derive the spirit and principles of the Reformation—and then trace the presence of the same spirit, as far as it prevails, in our modern systems of politics. Thus the true results may in part be separated from the alien elements.

I. ALTERED RELATION OF CHURCH, STATE, AND PEOPLE.

Martin Luther was a citizen of Saxony, whose ruler was the Elector Frederick the Wise, but the elector was under the dominion of the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V. Luther,

having been excommunicated by the Pope, appeared before the Emperor at Worms in 1521, who permitted him to leave in safety, but published an edict against him. But the Elector of Saxony, having the support of many of the other German princes, protected Luther, and the emperor did not dare to force the issue. Thus the old state of Saxony came to recognize a new ecclesiastical organization within its borders.

Ulrich Zwingli was a citizen of the canton of Zurich, which was a member of the Swiss Confederation. Zurich chose to recognize his teachings and the Reformed Church of Zwingli became the church of the canton; there was an ecclesiastical revolution, but no political change.

In England, Henry VIII, coming into conflict with the Pope, defied his power, had Parliament pass an act of supremacy (1534) by which the king was made the head of the Church in England. Thus the political organization remained, but a new ecclesiastical organization was recognized.

Holland, or the Dutch Republic, was originally a part of the domain of Philip II of Spain, but when he attempted the persecution of the Protestants, the northern states of the Netherlands, under William of Orange, formed a new republic, and successfully defied the former ruler; and this new state established the Church of Calvin as the State Church. Here we have a new Church, and a new state; but the attack upon the old state was not on the principle that the new Church required a new state, but because of the intolerance of the old state.

In every case, except that of republican Switzerland, there had been a king at the head of a party of nobles, all of whom were faithful members of the Roman Catholic Church. The sovereignty of the king was recognized by the Pope at Rome, and the Church's members were directed to yield their allegiance to the king, and pay him the taxes which he and his nobility might levy. By the side of the king and secular nobility existed the archbishops and all the lesser priests of the Roman Church, living partly on the rental of their lands,

and partly by the tithes which they collected from the subjects of the king. In return for the Pope's support of the king's right to levy taxes, the king supported the clergy in their collection of tithes. Any citizen who dared to oppose the Church, and incur excommunication became at once an outlaw and subject to criminal procedure. Thus state and Church stood together.

Then, along with state and Church in each kingdom, we find the people, the third estate, composed of the burgher class, fast becoming wealthy, and the great mass of peasants. They had no share in state or Church, except as concessions had been made by the king or Church. But their wealth, and their growing self-respect made them a factor whose support meant much to the Church and the state. They had never known anything but the double allegiance of the king and the Pope. They approached their God through the priesthood, and there was no salvation except by the gift of the Church; there was no peace and safety on earth except under the protection of the king and his nobility. Eternal salvation was in the hands of the priesthood; and physical safety lay in the hands of the nobility. From time to time, one of his class might be elevated to the secular or the spiritual nobility, but his class as such had no representation in the councils of these two classes.

When the Pope excommunicated Luther, the legal result should have been his arrest and punishment by the elector of Saxony as an outlaw, and the refusal of every private citizen to have any dealings with him. Of course, the Church in Saxony should have cast him out at once as a heretic. But all three parties failed to do their formal duty. The elector protected and encouraged the man who should have suffered the fate of an outlaw; the people made a hero of him; and the priests of Saxony, in large numbers, followed him in his beliefs and practices. Even the Emperor Charles V, cowed by the stand of the elector, did not molest Luther.

Thus we have a three-fold revolt against the Pope. The

king renounces his obligation to punish an enemy of the Church; the people renounce their obligations as members of the Church to have no intercourse with the heretic; and the priests themselves secede from the rule of Rome, and take their land with them. Each party, who had taken this risk, felt some credit for the Reformation. If any one of the three had refused to go with Luther, the Reformation would have been a failure. The elector was now freed from the dictation of Rome; the Church was now free from the control of Rome; the people were now free from the papal legates. They all had gained, and they all had their share of credit for the change.

Previous to the Reformation, there had been one great check upon the growth of the national spirit. The subjects of the Elector of Saxony were not only Saxon citizens, but they were also citizens of the Church of God on earth, with her head at Rome—a vast international commonwealth, which bound them to the citizens of alien states. The king had to consider the attitude of the Pope before he could wage war; for within his borders were the priests, who in the name of the Church might oppose what he wished to do. But with the Reformation, this was changed; his subjects had no foreign allegiance, and he was at liberty to further the interests of the state, without any need of consulting the wishes of the Roman Church.

As we have already shown, what happened in Germany took place in England, Switzerland, and Holland. In this new political order that followed the Reformation, we have this interesting question raised, viz.: shall the new Church succeed to all the rights and privileges of the old Roman Church, within the borders of the state? or shall it become a society, directly under the control of the king? And another question presents itself, viz.: shall the people who have shared in the secession receive larger rights in the new order? Shall the king and his nobility take all the benefits of the expulsion of Rome? or shall the benefits be divided with the new Church, and the “third estate”? We may put the matter briefly by

stating that three elements entered into the Reformation—the army that fought, the Church that prayed, and the people that paid. And we see in the history of political institutions since the Reformation this struggle between the three parties for their rights.

What happened may be illustrated by a consideration of what occurred when Charlemagne was crowned at Rome on Christmas Day, 800 A. D. The Roman Empire had broken down, and a new line must be inaugurated. Charlemagne had the secular power, and the Pope crowned him as the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire while the people of Rome applauded. In the Reformation, the old Roman Catholic Church had come to an end in the Reformation states; and the kings recognized the new Reformation Churches as the successor of the expelled hierarchy, and the people accepted the priests so appointed. Was the Church from this time forward the creature of the state? or was the Church still the institution ordained directly by God, and standing on an equality with the state?

Bryce says of the crowning of Charlemagne: "Charles did not conquer, nor the Pope give, nor the people elect. As the act was unprecedented, so it was illegal; it was the revolt of the ancient Western capital against the daughter who had become mistress; an exercise of the sacred right of insurrection, justified by the weakness and wickedness of the Byzantine princes, hallowed to the eyes of the world by the sanction of Christ's representative, but founded upon no law, nor competent to create any for the future" (H.R.E. 60).

The reasoning applies to the Reformation. The Roman Church, by her corruption, had produced such a righteous indignation in the hearts of nobility, clergy and people of Germany, Switzerland, Holland and England, that they exercised the sacred right of insurrection. The act was unprecedented and illegal; but the act was thoroughly justified in the sight of God, who saw His Church saved from death, and worship restored in part, to the spirit of the Christ. The king broke

his agreement with the Pope; the priests were untrue to their vows, and the people broke their confirmation pledges; but there is a deeper law written in the hearts of men, and there is a sacred right of insurrection which has saved the world from itself more than once. There are times when the law becomes the servant of sin.

If we go back to the institution of any nation, or empire, do we not have the same basis for authority as we find in the case of Charlemagne? When the new order comes, when the ruler is crowned, there is an agreement between the state, the Church, and the people, to drop their differences and adopt a certain working basis for government. But they never solve the question of the source of authority in a legal way. Each party—the state, the Church, the people—allow their claims to rest, but they do not deny or surrender them. May we not claim that God gives each party its share in the creation of every just government? The king, or the president, feels a responsibility to a Higher Power; he is in office, not only to carry out the will of the people, but also the will of God. The Church is not in existence to preach what the people or the king desires, but what God reveals. And the people are not the blind slaves of the state, or the Church, but their demands are, in part, the voice of God. God speaks to the world through all three parties; and every existing government stands upon a working agreement between the three. This is a principle we may derive from the Reformation.

When the German states recognized the Lutheran religion, the result was the following. The new Church society made overtures to the old state, the old political machine, that they should throw off their former allegiance to the Roman Church, and make the new Church, the state Church. When this offer was accepted, the result was that the members of the new Church were willing to pay taxes to the old state, and the members of the new Church were not considered traitors to the old state, but the real citizens. The Roman Church, no longer permitted to collect tithes, had lost its official standing,

and its revenue in the state. Members of the Roman Church might later be tolerated as citizens, but they were debarred from office. Thus the Catholics were deprived of a two-fold source of revenue, viz., the tithes of the people, paid to the priests, and the revenues of office, paid to the Catholic office-holders. No Church could stand such a loss of patronage.

When Elizabeth ascended the throne, a law was passed, providing that no Catholic could hold any office or employment under the crown, or any ecclesiastical office in England, or receive any university degree; for all such persons were required to take an oath renouncing the authority of the Pope, and acknowledging the headship of the queen in ecclesiastical matters.¹ Thus the English queen was freed from any obligation to the Pope, she drove from office all those who refused to join her in this independence, and attempted to place the new Church under her control.

Luther acquiesced in a similar arrangement in Saxony. He placed the Church under the protection of the state, and the religion of the ruler became the religion of the subjects. Though in a spiritual sense the Church still remained a divine institution, guided by the voice of God, in practice, the decision as to what the Church should preach, and what worship she should adopt was under the control of the king, who had the power to appoint the ministers, and adopt or reject the symbols of the new Church. We see this political result of the Reformation in the adoption of our own Heidelberg Catechism in 1563 by the Elector Frederick.

II. WEAKENED STATES DUE TO RELIGIOUS DISCORD.

This lack of a common faith in the various German states resulted finally in the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648). "The Reformation, with the wars to which it gave rise, made Germany for a time the most conspicuous state in Europe, but its ultimate effect was to reduce that state to a degree of material poverty, political insignificance, and intellectual torpidity un-

¹ Cheyney, *European Background*, 204.

known before in her experience.”² From 1530, when the League of Schmalkald was formed by the Protestant princes, Germany was divided into two camps, and before the question whether Rome would allow the New Church to live was settled, Germany had suffered everything that a country can suffer and still be said to live. The Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, decided the issue in favor of Protestantism.

One thing is certain, that the Protestant states, with this consciousness of the precious gift of religious liberty, were able to withstand the crushing power of the states faithful to Rome. The friends of Rome and Church unity will blame the horrible warfare upon the errors of the Reformation; the friends of Luther will say that it was due to the unjust effort of a cruel mother to retain control over a child that was entitled to his freedom. But its lesson is the need of some general religious understanding among the subjects of any state that wishes long to survive. And this means such a pure, reasonable, virile religious faith that it will continue to commend itself to a progressive, enlightened people. If the German states had been united in the Reformation, the Pope could never have caused the awful internal warfare of the Thirty Years’ War. The state may rule the Church, as far as the eye of man can see, but the state’s continued peace depends upon the protection of such a faith, or faiths, that the religious devotion of a large majority of the subjects is satisfied thereby.

England was successful in preventing any difference of religious faith interfering with her peace. Elizabeth stamped out the Catholic party, and was supported by a united Church; but in Germany there were too many independent princes, and their division upon the question of what religion Germany should adopt was the cause of the ruin of Germany. The fate of that unfortunate country during the Thirty Years’ War does not show either the justice or the injustice of the new faith; it only shows that any country that enters upon such a movement with divided councils will suffer. “Every king-

² Cheyney, *European Background*, 187.

dom divided against itself is brought to desolation." Yet better the suffering and the life of Germany, than the acquiescence and the life of a Spain. Better the suffering of a struggle for freedom than the stagnation and death of bondage to a dying system. Germany has now fallen upon the other horn of the dilemma; she has travelled from the despotism of the Church to the despotism of state, but she has made history during the intervening four hundred years.

III. THE NEW STATE DESIRED BY THE EXTREMISTS.

We now come to a movement that went beyond the spirit of the conservative Reformers, such as Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. We refer to the Anabaptists. Their leaders condemned not only the Church of Rome, but the existing state as well; and their new Church refused to make any overtures to the existing civil government. They believed that a true Christian could not hold fellowship with the citizens of the state. Therefore, when a man joined their body, they rebaptized him into their body, and thereby signalized their renunciation of their allegiance to the world's state, and the world's Church. They were joining a new society, not recognized by the state; and this society was waiting for the miraculous coming of the Kingdom of God from heaven, in which they would find fit companions to rule this world; and from this new state, all who were not rebaptized would be excluded.

Whether believing in resistance, like the Muenster Baptists, led by John of Leyden, or believing in non-resistance, like the Mennonites, they were in reality revolutionists against Church and state, waiting for the overturning of existing governments, and the ushering in of the heavenly kingdom, in which they should have a part. The result was that they were frequently punished with death for administering rebaptism; for this rebaptism was heresy against the state Church, and consequently treason against the state. They had no civil offices from which their members could derive a revenue; they had no members

in office to mitigate the rigors of the law; they had no power to exact Church dues from their members. They were literally pilgrims upon earth driven from one country to another, looking for the coming of the Lord.

The Reformation, as understood by Luther and Zwingli, left the existing state unchanged, except that the Church which they recognized was changed. But the Anabaptists wished to abolish Church and state. They swung to the extreme; they not only thought that the laity were as good as the clergy or the nobility, but they claimed that the laymen in the true Church were the only ones entitled to any office in the kingdom of God. Luther did not touch the question of the rights in the state, of the nobility and the people; Calvin, while not advocating popular rights, did nevertheless give the people larger rights in the representative system, based upon the Presbyterian idea; but the Anabaptists desired a pure democracy, whose test of citizenship should be membership in the new and the true Church. Old state and old Church, old noble and old priest, should be swallowed up in the new Church, universal, and exclusive, which should be the Kingdom of God on earth.

IV. MODERN TOLERATION.

Every European state that adopted the principles of the Reformation has an established Church, down to this day. The half-way measures of Luther and Zwingli, the idea of disestablishing and frequently barring the Roman Catholic Church, has been adopted; but the Reformers did not attempt to establish a new evangelical Church, claiming the superior authority of the old Roman Church. Whether they surrendered any of the Church's equality with the state, is an open question. But they did not attempt to set the Church over the state in secular matters.

How far are the results in America the logical outgrowth of the Reformation principles? In the first amendment to the United States Constitution, we read: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting

the free exercise thereof." This is neither the Roman Catholic doctrine, nor the Reformation doctrine, nor the Anabaptist doctrine. The state in America is absolutely divorced from the Church, not in the sense of being hostile, but in the sense of showing no partiality to any one religious body, and encouraging all that labor for the religious training of her citizenship.

Other nations have tolerated all religions—notably England and Holland; but no other nation has refused to recognize any while encouraging all. Bryce says: "The influence of Christianity seems to be, if we look not merely to the numbers, but also to the intelligence of the persons influenced, greater and more widespread in the United States than in any part of western continental Europe, and I think greater than in England."³

The great danger to all political institutions arising from the establishment of any faith by the state is the hostility from those Churches excluded, or the external influence of that Church which has been recognized. Too often, the kings of Germany and England, before the Reformation, found that their subjects were looking to Rome, and not to their national capitals for their instructions. The national spirit had little chance to grow with this constant pressure of outside influence. Allen says: "It was not Luther who shattered the so-called Catholic unity into fragments, but the expansion of the national consciousness, whether in France, or Germany, or in England. This was the force which took from the Church its temporal power, and by so doing initiated the process which was to restore it to its earlier and purer condition, when it was a pervasive spiritual influence, depending upon its advocacy of truth and the voluntary recognition of its disciples for maintaining and extending its influence."⁴

On the other hand, the establishment of the Anglican Church in England led to plottings by Catholic and Dissenter.

* Amer. Commonw., Vol. 2, 710.

• Contin. Christ. Thought, 248.

Kings of Catholic countries were led to enmity against England by the partial treatment accorded another faith. England did the only thing possible; she recognized the faith of the people who were going to fight her battles. But America has been more fortunate; she has had such an even balancing of power between all creeds, largely through the general immigration from so many different lands, that she has been able to encourage all, and establish none. There is an equilibrium maintained in the religious life of America by the concert of religions. They may not meet in formal session, but they know and respect each other's power, even if they do not respect each other's faith.

We are all aware that the Church of the Reformation has substituted the Bible for the decrees of the Roman Church Council as the Constitution of the Church. But in England and Germany, the interpreters of this Bible are appointed by the Crown; and the interpretation is kept in safe hands, as far as the Established Church is concerned. But in America, the state has absolutely nothing to do with the appointment. The nearest approach to a European precedent for this absolute divorce of Church and state is to be found in the Separatist congregations of Browne, Barrow, and Greenwood in England, which led to the congregations of the Pilgrim Fathers. Browne said: "And, therefore, because the Church is a commonwealth, it is of their (the magistrates') charge; that is concerning the outward provision and outward justice; they are to look to it; but to compel religion, to plant churches by power, and to force a submission to Ecclesiastical government by laws and penalties, belongeth not to them."

America has set certain broad limits beyond which no religion can go; but as long as men's religious practices do not transgress the criminal laws of the land, any congregation—yes, any individual—may interpret his Bible as he pleases, and put such interpretation into practice. The United States recognizes this as a right; but the religious faiths, represented in this country, in very many cases still maintain that their

belief is the only true faith, and that ultimately it must be the exclusive faith of the land. Even the Pilgrim Fathers who pleaded so strongly for the right of the individual Congregation to interpret the Bible were themselves intolerant of other Congregations who interpreted the Bible and did not arrive at the same conclusion.

America's political system, in its attitude toward the religious faith of her citizens, is the crystallized sentiment of the cool-headed and liberal-minded of all faiths here represented. France, through her religious wars, gave us her best citizens; and the same was true of England and Germany. These immigrants discovered that when they put religious leaders in charge of the interpretation of the Bible, and kept politicians in the affairs of the state, that Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, and Catholic were able to live in peace, side by side. In Europe, half the religious wars were not in reality caused by religious differences but by scheming leaders, who were attempting to further their political aims by capitalizing the bigotry of their coreligionists.

Of course we have a class of citizens who, having no love for any creed, favor the disestablishment of religion in the hope that it may result in the weakening of religion, and the growth of infidelity. But these people have reckoned without their host in America. Our political system is not the ideal of the Reformers, but neither is it the friend of the atheists. Truth is powerful, and the fact that vital religion is more effective in America where there is no state Church than in any other country in the world—the fact that the missionary influence of America is unsurpassed—show that our system has caught a vision beyond that of the Reformers, which was to free the state from the blighting influence of a secular Church, but failed to free the Church from the blighting influence of a secular state.

Luther had the grand vision that the just should live by faith. The American Churches are living because they have members who depend upon their faith in Christ for their salvation

and not upon a state-supported Church. They are willing to support their Church; and they do not ask the state to do so. But, on the other hand, they object to having the state levy taxes upon them for the support of another Church, or to repressive laws against their faith. Luther could not get that liberty for the new Church; he would not have believed that such liberty was wise. In fact, the weak Reformation Church and the strong Catholic Church would not have lived long side by side. But the consequence of state protection was that the new Church involved the state in war; and the old state fettered the religious growth of the new Church. It was a necessary evil endured to avoid worse evils.

V. THE AUTHORITY TO RECOGNIZE A NEW NATION.

A very interesting question is presented when we consider the matter of the recognition of a new government since the Reformation. Before that time, when the Pope recognized a successful usurper, that settled the matter, until another revolution occurred; but since the rulers of all Reformed lands are theoretically under the ban of the Pope, who shall now decide whether a new government shall be recognized? That is one of the great changes that has been produced by the Reformation.

The establishment of the United States of America offers a case in point. In the Declaration of Independence, the colonies declared that "governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed." This is a statement of no Reformation principle; this comes from Rousseau's *Contrat Social*. But by acknowledging the existence of bonds with England, they admitted the existence of a previous *Contrat Social* which had to be abrogated. No one party to an existing contract can be released without the consent of the other party, or without a valid justification for its violation. America, in the Declaration of Independence, was making an appeal to the existing governments of the world to ratify her action in dissolving her bonds with England, and in instituting

a new government. Thus, the existence of the new government did not rest upon the mere consent of the governed, but also upon the recognition of the new nation by the existing powers. The people—or rather the colonies—of America were asking for a franchise in the League of World Powers.

Thus, the Reformation substituted for the Pope a League of World Powers, without whose recognition no new power could hope to exist as an independent state. The power of the Church to forbid the birth of new nations was gone; but that power didn't pass over to the people. The states of the world still granted or refused recognition, and thus made or killed new nations. If France had refused to recognize the colonies, all the fine statements about the consent of the governed would not have saved our infant life.

The Reformers never claimed that the people were entitled to rule. They gave the people the evangelical doctrines which increased their valuation of the individual as over against the institution; but Luther had the highest regard for the state as an institution, and considered it as something higher than an aggregate of individuals. Each new acquisition of power by popular government has been the result of a demand by the people, based upon an assertion of right, and a concession of such right by the sovereignty under which they lived; or it has been a concession of right by the concert of existing governments in the form of the recognition of a new state.

The Reformation principle in regard to the individual and the Church was that each citizen must belong to the Church, and this Church would be selected by the ruler. The modern principle is that you can either belong or not belong to any Church, according to your own wish. Here there is a marked change. The Reformation principle was that you must belong to some state; and this principle still holds. You can become a citizen of any state, recognized by your former sovereign, by transfer of allegiance; but you cannot cease to be a citizen of some state. Before you can get your dismissal from France, you must swear allegiance to America, or some other state recog-

nized by France. Thus we perceive that the Reformation desired to keep all men bound as to state duties; and there is no such thing legally as an anarchist. The Reformation did not intend to permit any man to become an anarchist in regard to the Church; for that is what every man outside of the Church is. Each man was supposed to remain in some Church. But experience has shown that formal membership in a Church hurts the Church more than it helps her; and America has supplemented the Reformation doctrine, to the benefit of the Church. The state, however, is a different matter; taxes are not voluntary offerings; they are essential duties which ought to be levied by force if necessary.

VI. INSTITUTIONALISM AND INDIVIDUALISM.

The political results of the Reformation have been in degree and not in kind. Institutionalism has been modified, and not abolished; individualism has been developed, and not created. The Reformers were Platonists, Transcendentalists, and accordingly institutionalists. But they were also heirs of the Mystics like Eckart and Tauler, who emphasized the indwelling Deity. The result of their religious teaching led men to self-development through the cultivation of the Holy Spirit within the heart. And when a man comes to know God by direct communion, and discovers that grace is not confined to the sacraments of the Church, he loses a portion of that awe which formerly possessed him in the presence of the priest. With this new feeling comes a modification of respect for the institution of the Church, and more for the indwelling God who lives in the really sanctified servant of the Church. There is more of the feeling that the institution derives her power from the godly lives of the faithful priests, and less of the feeling that the priests derive their power from the transcendent power of the Church.

But they also retained the saving truth that the Church and the state are blessed of Christ in a way that one hundred million unconnected individuals cannot be. Call the Church

a spiritual entity, or a relationship of Christlike men, call the state a political entity, or an association of citizens with the same political ideals, they can do things that the individuals without this unifying power cannot do. Consider a sheaf of wheat; it may be bound with wheat taken from the heap that lay on the ground, or it may be a piece of twine totally dissimilar; but in either case, it serves a purpose, and is distinct from the part held together. In an aristocratic state, the governing body is drawn from the nobility, and are separate not only in their function but in their private life; in a democratic state, the government or institution is separate in function, but exactly the same in their private life. The true spirit of the Reformation was to modify the authority of Church and state, and not to abolish it. The Reformers did not discard the idea of sacramental grace, and divine right; but they did emphasize the indwelling Deity in each individual. In Church and state, the members and citizens are electors and not rulers. Absolute democracy and organized life are incompatible.

The Reformers turned from Pope and Church Council to the Bible for their authority. In the Scriptures, they found the combination of authority and autonomy. It took years for the lesson to be pushed to its logical conclusion; but it is the spirit of the Reformation to bring forth all the treasures from the Word of God. In Acts 6, when the seven deacons were to be chosen, we find the following method pursued. "Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business." The people picked out from their own number seven men, but the apostles reserved the right of veto. The Reformers developed the individual, but did not deny the necessity for an institution; the consistent development of their ideas looked toward a

republican form of government; but it did not tend toward a pure democracy in which the institution is annihilated.

Lutheranism, more inclined to depend upon the spirit and less upon the letter of the Word of God, did not push these teachings to their logical conclusions. Calvinism with its strong element of legalism has, from the first, been the foe of monarchy, and the friend of republican governments. Both Luther and Calvin turned to the Bible as the infallible word of God; but Luther emphasized the right of the individual to have direct access to the Father through Christ, and neglected the rights of the citizen in the state; while Calvin, without denying the truths that Luther proclaimed, laid more emphasis upon the rights of the individual in the state; and the Calvinistic Churches have always taken a keen interest in the conduct of the state. The logical outcome has been the republics that we find in Holland, and in the United States.

The modern monistic conception that all power is derived from the people in whom the immanent God dwells, is not a result of the Reformation. That conception comes in the wake of modern philosophy, to which an opening was given by the Reformation. Our Federal Constitution recites in the preamble, that "We, the people of the United States . . . do establish this Constitution." But the Constitution itself was a club placed in the hands of the elected officers to guard against the sudden whims of the people. The people, by a fiction, signed away certain rights, and imposed upon themselves certain duties; they set up a state above and apart from the people, guarded from the people by a charter. But more than that; before the United States Constitution became operative it had to be adopted by the separate states of the American confederation, to the number of nine. No; the will of the people was not sufficient to establish the new state. They were already under governments, and that government had to recognize the authority of the new government before it had any authority over the citizens of the states.

But what shall we say of the Church in America, as an in-

stitution? Does she still remain a divine institution to be taken account of by the State? Yes; just as long as the religious consciousness is as widespread as it is now in America, the interpreters of God's will will continue to exercise a powerful influence over the rulers of the state. State recognition does not make a Church strong; this strength depends upon the loyalty of her adherents.

Professor Allen chose a striking title for his great series of lectures, when he termed them "The Continuity of Christian Thought." Continuity is a word that we ought to place side by side with the word Reformation. Restoration would be as appropriate a term for the movement as Reformation. When the "times are out of joint" somebody must be born to set them right. The Reformers tried to restore the proper balance between the three great estates, the state, the Church, and the people. Running through the ages, there has been a state defying the unbridled wishes of the Church and people. Whence has her authority come? Running through the ages there has been a Church defying the unbridled wishes of state and people, even as Christ stood between the cruelty of Rome and the madness of the zealots. Whence has her authority come? And likewise running through the ages, there has been the vox populi, which is also the vox Dei, defying the unbridled ambitions of Church and state. This latter class is largely composed of the heads of families, standing for the rights of the average citizen. Whence has his authority come? In so far as the Modern Age has adjusted the relationship between these three divine institutions, state, Church, and people, that age has been true to the ideals of the Reformation. Just so far as she has attacked the true position of either of the three, she has introduced a strange spirit.

We suppose that many persons will concede the influence of the state and the individual to-day; but they fail to see the influence of any Church in political institutions. Paul said that the things that are seen are temporal, but that the things that are not seen are eternal. So it is with the Church; there

is an international, universal communion of believers, which forms an inter-Church law, just as there is between nations an international law. It is the deep chord that responds when enemies go beyond little sectarian differences, and touch the eternal verities of religion. It is the heart of that Church that has been touched by the horrors of Armenia; it is that Church that supports the Red Cross; it is that Church that has made the difference between the military campaigns of Sargon and Nebuchadnezzar, and the campaigns of modern warfare, though the difference is not what it should be. Yes; the Church still lives to watch the state and the people.

All the great modern nations are those which have in one manner or another slipped the leash of the Roman Catholic Church. But where that balance of power, formerly possessed by the Roman Church, has not been replaced by the power of the invisible Church, there has been loss and suffering. When there is no force in the nation to uphold the laws of humanity, they are overridden, to the damage of the nation itself, and the outside world, that must vindicate them. Troeltsch declared "that the Lutheran type of Protestantism was politically favorable to absolutism, and that enlightened absolutism after the Prussian style was inherently the result of Protestantism."⁵ John Knox didn't defy the Queen of Scots in the name of an international Church; but he did dare to mix in politics, when he considered that the politics of his land were contrary to the will of God.

It is true that Jesus said: "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things which are God's"; but He did not give us a catalogue to show which is which. But when the state takes a hand in the appointment of the priest, we may be sure that Cæsar is interfering in the things of God, and the things of God will finally suffer.

If Lutheranism had been left free to appoint her own preachers; and the state had not interfered with the liberty of criticism of the life of the people, the story would be dif-

* Klein, *REF. CH. REV.*, Oct., 1916, 537.

ferent in Germany to-day. America owes her political life to the religious freedom of her pulpits, which are filled with men under no obligations to the political powers, except the bounds of decent criticism, and the laws of libel and slander.

Turn to France, and learn a lesson. Catholicism kept control of that country; the Reformation never gained control of that country; and the result was finally the disestablishment of Romanism, and the recognition of no religion, with a widespread hostility to all. And this lack of a vigorous Church has handicapped the state, because there was no organized body commanding the respect of the great mass of the people to present the claims of Christ upon the nation. The Roman Church had taken such a deep grip on France that it required an alliance with the enemies of Christ to effect her deliverance in the French Revolution; and from the effects of that heavy price, France has not recovered down to this day.

All states stand upon three legs; shorten either one, and the result will be disastrous. Just as the surveyor's theodolite must be supported by the three legs of equal length before correct observations can be made, thus the outlook of every nation must be gained through officers who stand for the equal rights of the state, the Church, and the people in the nation. The great political result of the Reformation is that ultimately through this movement there has been an equalization of these three great institutions in the state.

STROUDSBURG, PA.

VIII.

THE ARGUMENT FOR A FINITIST THEOLOGY.

RAY H. DOTTERER.

I.

INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATIONS.

1. *The Method of Theological Inquiry.*—Theology may adopt any one of three methods or it may combine two or all of them with varying emphasis upon each. It may appeal to the immediate experience of the mystic, or it may simply affirm and arrange in systematic form the doctrines authoritatively taught by the Church and the Bible, or it may depend upon the “reason” and “conscience” of the individual inquirer.

The first method would of course be the best if the experience in question were not so rare. Assuming that the experience of the mystic constitutes a genuine insight into the fundamental nature of reality, he nevertheless stands in the same relation to his fellowmen as a man with normal vision to a race of men blind from their birth. It would be vain for the seeing man to discourse of the beautiful colors to be seen on every side. Indeed, it would be impossible for him to express his experience in words, since language is a social product, and the social mind of the hypothetical race would know nothing of color. Thus the mystic’s direct vision of God can not be described in terms which can be understood by ordinary men, and, even from his own point of view or from that of a fellow mystic, his experience must ever remain in a measure ineffable. Moreover, the difficulty of the mystical method is aggravated by the fact that the non-mystic may not be willing to grant the objectivity of the mystic’s experience.

And the rarity of his experience may be made a reason for regarding it as illusory. Indeed, it may be very plausibly maintained that the alleged "revelations" of the traditional mystic are evidences of a pathological condition produced by his long-continued vigils and fastings. This hypothesis is suggested, at least, by phenomena such as those which William James has described under the name of the "anæsthetic revelation."¹ Accordingly, the non-mystic may be justified in believing that his lack of the sense of immediate fellowship with absolute reality is not an indication of spiritual poverty, but rather an evidence of sanity.

The second method—that of external authority—received a mortal wound in the time of the Reformation, when it was discovered that the two sources of authoritative teaching, the Church and the Bible, did not always agree. To be sure, the Protestant as well as the Roman Catholic still retained the method of authority. But the mere knowledge that the schism had occurred operated to impair the confidence of the intelligent layman in authority of any kind; and for the theologically trained man the Protestant appeal to the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice contained the seed of its own destruction. For the careful study of the sacred writings which was logically required by the formal principle of Protestantism soon showed that these writings, instead of containing one uniform and consistent revelation, contain several different and even conflicting systems of doctrine, and bear clear evidence of having been produced in much the same way as the other sacred books of antiquity. Thus, although this was certainly not the intention of the original Reformers, the logical and historical result of the Reformation has been to refer all questions of doctrine to the "private judgment" of the individual Christian.

The third method, that of reliance upon reason and conscience, is, accordingly, the one that is dominant at the present

¹ *The Will to Believe*, pp. 294 ff. (Note: For full titles, etc., see the appended bibliography.)

time at least among enlightened men and women. Having thrown off the authority of the Church, and being distrustful of the genuineness of the mystic's experience, they take as their only criterion of truth the reasonableness and ethical attractiveness of the doctrines in question.

It is important to note, however, that these three theological methods—that of the mystic, that of the authoritarian, and that of the self-reliant reasoner—are almost never found pure. The traditional mystic has usually been, or at least supposed himself to be, a loyal son of the Church; and his revelations have usually been in superficial agreement with its teachings. St. Thomas Aquinas employs the method of authority; but he also reasons, so long, at least, as reasoning serves his purpose. The "modern" man is no more consistent. Theologians who in theory have given up the appeal to any external authority nevertheless slip back now and then into the argument from Scripture and tradition. And among religious people who are not theologians, one result of the modern revolt against the authority of the Church and the Book has been a curious sentimentalism in religious thinking, a sort of mitigated mysticism, which exalts "intuition" and "immediate feeling" as over against "reason."

It must be admitted, I think, that there is a sense in which the Scriptures possess authority, and ought to possess authority, even for the completely emancipated thinker. Their authority may be described as *suggestive* rather than *coercive*, as *accidental* rather than *constitutive*. Many biblical doctrines are found to be true, but their truth neither consists in nor is established by their quality of being biblical. In other words, the authority of the Bible is not like that of a constitution or of a legal code, but rather like that of a textbook in chemistry or some other laboratory science, the statements contained in which are to be accepted or rejected by the student according as they are, or are not, experimentally verified.

There is also a relative justification for the claims of "intuition," "instinct," or "immediate feeling." This justifica-

tion consists in the obvious fact that "reason" in the sense of mere intellection is barren. Before there can be any reasoning in this narrow sense of the term, there must be (*a*) sense-perception, and (*b*) perception of "goods" or of relative values. Viewed in this way, reason does not bring forth truth; it has the humbler office of determining which of the offspring of "intuition" may be worthy of preservation and ought to be acknowledged as true. In other words, we may be said to reason when we inquire which of our immediate perceptions of fact or of value are implied by or are incompatible with other immediate perceptions. Thus there is a sense in which both sense-perception and the perception of values are more fundamental than reasoning. But immediate perception alone is not a sufficient criterion of truth. For one of our perceptions of fact is that immediate perceptions, whether we limit our view to the experience of one mind or consider the experience of a larger or smaller group, are not all logically compatible; and that they *ought* to be logically compatible is one of our perceptions of value. If this perception of value is to be accepted as genuine, *some* immediate perceptions and *some* inferences from such perceptions must be rejected as illusory or mistaken. But when immediate perceptions are found to be mutually repugnant, that is to say, when it is impossible for all of them to be genuine in the same logical universe, the only arbiter that can decide between them is the reason. Indeed this deciding between incompatible verdicts of "intuition" is what we mean by *reason*, when we say that the method of theology must be the method of reason, rather than of mystical experience or of dependence upon authority.²

2. *The Religious Value of the Idea of God.*—We value the idea of God, and seek to convince ourselves that the idea is "real," because we feel the need of God. Our interest, however, is practical rather than theoretical. As far as the man of science is concerned there may be a God; but the scientist long ago discovered that he, as *scientist*, has "no need of that

² Cf. Russell, *Scientific Method in Philosophy*, pp. 21 f.

hypothesis." If, for example, a geologist should tell us that the strata of rocks occur in a given order because God laid them down in that way, or if a botanist should say that a certain flower has five petals because God made it thus, even the least enlightened theist would admit that the assertion is from the standpoint of science irrelevant. And, in general, to "explain" the occurrence of any particular phenomenon or group of phenomena by reference to divine agency is an evasion of the problem at issue.

The value of the idea of God is, then, to be sought in the domain of practice rather than of theory. It is moral and religious rather than scientific. Traditional theology has given the Divine Being the attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, and moral perfection. Modern theology places moral perfection first, and rightly insists that the other attributes have religious value only when moral perfection is presupposed. First of all, God is good; and his infinite wisdom and might are subservient to his infinite love.³

Beginning, then, with the thought of the infinite goodness of God, one use of the notion of Deity at once suggests itself. God, as the absolutely good being, is man's moral goal or pattern. "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect," becomes the maxim of the truly devout worshipper. God is the supremely perfect hero, the supreme object of imitation.

Next, combining the notion of perfect goodness with that of omniscience, we derive the idea of God as the righteous and completely informed Judge of human conduct. The more naïve worshipper thinks of a day of judgment at the end of the world; the more sophisticated, of a judgment continually going on. Whichever way the thought is taken, the believer in an all-wise and perfectly good Being has always before him the idea of an impartial and all-seeing Spectator who "searcheth the reins and the hearts." What is concealed from one's fellowmen is fully known to him. Wherein one has been misjudged by his fellows, he is judged rightly by God. At the

³ Cf. Clarke, *The Christian Doctrine of God*, pp. 70 ff.

tribunal of the Omniscient One, absolute justice is dispensed.

Furthermore God is all-powerful. He is the Sovereign of the Universe. He has created, and now upholds and governs all. Because he is omnipotent his universal purpose will eventually be completely fulfilled. The life of the believer himself and that of the group to which he belongs can not become a failure. Defeats are merely reverses, suffering is chastisement. Faith in an omnipotent God is the ground of an assured confidence in the ultimate triumph of the right and the eternal survival of the good.

Lastly, the attribute of omnipresence makes possible the thought of a divine Companion and Friend. Though foes may scorn and friends forsake, there is a heavenly Father to whom one may flee for sympathy. Though the believer is alone in the world, he is not alone, for God is with him.

Such, crudely and inadequately expressed, is the meaning of God in the experience of his worshippers. In a word, the heart of the true believer is filled with peace—with the “peace of God which passeth all understanding.”

But the peace of God is not a peace of quiescence. The truly religious man is not simply the contented man. His contentment is combined with a divine discontent with himself and his world. A “spark” has disturbed his “clod.” He, indeed, takes “no thought for the morrow,” but he labors for the morrow and for many days thereafter. He seeks “first the kingdom of God and his righteousness,” and yet is a man of affairs. He believes that the sin and the suffering and the sorrow of life have their place in the divine economy, yet he is a reformer and seeks to make the world better and happier.

3. *Some Antinomies in the Popular Notion of God.*—Such a paradoxical emotional attitude can hardly be supposed to be grounded in a logically consistent doctrine of God. Indeed the paradoxical character of the typical religious experience would suggest a self-contradictory ground. And no very profound study is required to show that the popular notion of God is shot through with contradictions. Some of these

are evident to the popular mind itself; others do not appear until the notion is examined with more than ordinary care. A few of the more obvious of these difficulties are the following.

(a) *Goodness versus Power in Relation to the Existence of Evil.*—According to traditional theology the world is partly evil, and is nevertheless the work of Infinite Power and Perfect Goodness. The antinomy is obvious: How can Omnipotent Goodness be supposed to have produced or to be the ground of an imperfect world? Attempts at reconciliation merely repeat the difficulty in a new form. Thus we hear men say that if God had not permitted some particular evil a greater evil would have occurred; that the pains and sufferings of life are means of chastisement and moral purification; that sin makes possible forms of goodness which outweigh both the sin itself and the evil consequences resulting from it. But it is obvious that this mode of explanation itself presupposes some limitation of divine power. It assumes that evil is a necessary condition of the perfection of the world, and that even Omnipotence is bound by this condition. The existence of evil is a proof of God's inability to remove it from his world, or, what amounts to the same thing, of his inability to remove or prevent it without defeating his universal purpose. Again, if we adopt the evolutionary point of view, and admit the idea of a temporal process into our reasonings about good and evil, we may say that, while God's world is not *yet* perfect, its perfection will come at the end of the evolutionary process. But the idea of evolution, the very notion of a process, is irreconcilable with omnipotence. For the idea of a *process* implies hindrance or retardation, and therefore the finitude of the energizing agent.

(b) *Righteousness versus Predestination.*—This is a special and aggravated case of the preceding difficulty. If God is omnipotent, he is the absolute Sovereign of his world, and all events are in accordance with his will; but if all events, including human actions, bad as well as good, are willed by God, then God is the real author of human sin.

(c) *The Hearing of Prayer versus Omniscience*.—If God be thought of after the analogy of an ancient oriental monarch, prayer may be regarded as necessary in order to propitiate the Despot when he is angry, or to overcome his carelessness, or his indifference to the well-being of his subjects. But, surely, in the case of a Sovereign who is perfectly good, prayer is not needed for *this* purpose. Again if God's power be limited, it may be maintained with considerable plausibility that prayer is a means of supplementing the energy which is insufficient for the accomplishment of some good purpose. But, according to the traditional doctrine, there is no defect of power, and prayer can not be justified in this way. Once more, if God's knowledge were limited, prayer, in the sense of petition for some definite boon, might be regarded as a means of informing God concerning human needs. The analogy of the eastern monarch here recurs, and doubtless has figured largely in the common theory of prayer. But if God is omniscient, we cannot tell him anything, and the antinomy remains unsolved.

(d) *Personality versus Immutability*.—According to traditional religious thought, God is a *person*, a Friend or Father with whom men may enjoy fellowship. On the other hand, he is also said to be "eternal," not merely in the sense that his existence is without beginning or end, but in the sense that he is supertemporal and immutable. But the attributes of personality and immutability are plainly contradictory. For a *person* is the subject of experience, and experience implies time. At any rate, human persons are in time; succession is of the very essence of their life; and therefore a divine Person who is assumed in any meaningful sense to know them and to fellowship with them must also be in time.

4. *A Prospectus of the Ensuing Discussion*.—We have seen that the attempt to think of God as omnipotent, omniscient, and immutable, and at the same time as a personal Being who is perfectly good, and who enters into communion with men and may be influenced by their petitions, is logically impossible. Accordingly, the next three sections will be devoted to

a critical exposition of two rival attempts to rationalize or to find a substitute for the traditional (Christian) conception of Deity. These contrasted theories are the theory of monistic idealism, which in its specifically theological aspect is a theory of the divine immanence, and that of pluralism, with its doctrine of a "finite" God. As my examination of these rival theories leads me to the acceptance of the latter, I have called the whole discussion "an argument for a finitist theology."

God has been said to be *infinite* in two different senses: (1) He has been said to be the Whole of reality, or at least to be the Ground and Source of all that is. (2) He has been said to be infinite in the literal numerical sense of the word; for example, to know an infinite multiplicity of knowledge-elements, or to be "eternal," either in the sense of living through an infinite sequence of moments, or in the sense of being super-temporal and yet in some manner containing infinite time. The God of monistic idealism, for example the "Absolute" as described by Josiah Royce, is held to be infinite in both of these senses. The Absolute is the all-inclusive Reality; and, by virtue of Royce's fundamental epistemological presuppositions, his one eternal or timeless Purpose includes or implies an infinite multiplicity of elements. Over against this monistic theory stand the theory of John Stuart Mill and William James, on the one hand, and that of Charles Renouvier, on the other. These theories, which I shall call respectively "ethical finitism" and "logical finitism," are mutually compatible, but, as we shall see, do not necessarily imply one another. The doctrine of a "finite" God as it is expounded by Mill and James consists essentially in the denial of God's infinitude in the former of our two senses. According to this view, God is *not omnipotent*. It is a view which is founded chiefly upon the difficulties of *theodicy*, upon the impossibility of "justifying the ways of God to man," if God is assumed to be infinite in the sense of possessing all knowledge and all power. According to Renouvier and his school, the finitude of the world and of God logically results from the self-contradiction which lurks in the conception of a "realized infinite."

The discussion of the theories of Royce and Renouvier will lead us to an examination of the so-called New Infinite of recent mathematics, as it has been defined by Richard Dedekind and Georg Cantor; for by his own account the idealism of Royce is logically dependent upon the validity of this conception, and the entire Renouvierist philosophy must go by the board if, as is maintained, the formulation of this new definition of infinity frees the notion of a realized infinite from the difficulties which Renouvier found in it. In view, therefore, of the strategic importance of this subsidiary issue, I shall devote Section VI to an examination of these contrasted ways of thinking about the infinite. My conclusion will be that the formulation of the "new" infinite has not removed the logical objections to monistic idealism, nor at all impaired the cogency of the reasonings of Renouvier and his disciples.

The last section will contain a brief summary of all that has gone before, together with a further examination of the conception of a "finite" God.

II.

THE MONISTIC ABSOLUTE AS THE PHILOSOPHIC EQUIVALENT OF GOD.

In our attempt to find a conception of God that is both rationally satisfactory and religiously serviceable we turn to the philosophers. Two types of theory may be distinguished: the monistic and the pluralistic. According to the monistic theories, God is the whole of existence; pluralistic theories, on the other hand, make God the part, but the controlling part of existence.

1. *Monistic Idealism as a Fulfilment of Traditional Theology.*—In this chapter we shall consider the monistic revision of the traditional conception of God. The theory of Josiah Royce may be taken as a typical expression of this class of theories.⁴

⁴ For Royce's account of his philosophic ancestry, see *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, pp. ix ff.

Royce's conception of God is regarded by its author, "not as destroying, but as fulfilling, the large collection of slowly evolving notions that have appeared in the course of history in connection with the name of God."⁵ He insists that "what the faith of our fathers has genuinely meant by God is, despite all the blindness and all the unessential accidents of religious tradition, identical with the inevitable outcome of a reflective philosophy."⁶ This conception "undertakes to be distinctly theistic, and not pantheistic. It is not the conception of an Unconscious Reality, into which finite beings are absorbed; nor of a Universal Substance, in whose law our ethical independence is lost; nor of an Ineffable Mystery, which we can only silently adore. On the contrary, every ethical predicate that the highest religious faith of the past has attributed to God is capable of exact interpretation in terms of our present view."⁷

Professor Royce's contribution to the theistic discussion consists, then, in the identification of God with the Absolute of idealistic philosophy; and in attempting so to define the Absolute as, on the one hand, to avoid the self-contradictions which are to be found in the notion of Deity as ordinarily conceived, and, on the other hand, to enrich the notion of the Absolute so that it shall be a fit object for the religious emotions or attitudes of awe and reverence, of faith, loyalty, and love. It is important to remember, however, that many idealistic philosophers have not been willing to regard the Absolute as personal, or in any significant sense as a Self. Thus Mr. F. H. Bradley does not apply the name God to the Absolute,⁸ and, if Dr. McTaggart is right, Hegel himself, who is commonly regarded as the father of this general way of thinking, ought not to have done so.⁹ His use of "God" and of other

⁵ Royce, *et al.*, *The Conception of God*, p. 48.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 50; see also *The Problem of Christianity*, Preface.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

⁸ *Appearance and Reality*, pp. 446 ff.

⁹ *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*, pp. 59 ff., 213.

religious terms, says McTaggart, was merely an accommodation to the "current mythology" of the time. According to Professor Royce, however, the Absolute of monistic idealism is what the Church has really meant all along by God; but this meaning has been only vaguely apprehended, and therefore only imperfectly expressed.

As defined by Royce, God, or the Absolute, includes in his own consciousness and will the content of all finite minds. The individual self is an identical part of the Divine Self.¹⁰

"Let us sum up, in a few words," says Royce, "our whole argument. There is, for us as we are, experience. Our thought undertakes the interpretation of this experience. Every intelligent interpretation of an experience involves, however, the appeal from this experienced fragment to some more organized whole of experience in whose unity this fragment is conceived as finding its organic place."¹¹ "There must be an experience to which is present the . . . actual limitation and narrowness of all finite experience."¹²

Furthermore, since every reality exists "just in so far as there is experience of its existence,"¹³ since, in other words, everything that is, is the content of mind, it follows that the "things" which we ordinarily think of as non-mental are included in the content of the Absolute Self.

"The reality that we seek to know," says Royce, "has always to be defined as that which either is or would be present to a sort of experience which we ideally define as an organized—that is, a united and transparently reasonable experience. We have, in point of fact, no conception of reality capable of definition except this one."¹⁴ "To assert that there is any absolutely real fact indicated by our experience, is to regard this reality as presented to an absolutely organized experience, in which every fragment finds its place."¹⁵

¹⁰ *The Conception of God*, p. xiii; *Hibbert Journal*, I, 44.

¹¹ *The Conception of God*, p. 42.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 41. Cf. *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, p. 441.

¹³ *The Conception of God*, p. 43.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

Professor Royce's conception of the Absolute is attained, then, by combining the traditional attribute of omniscience with the idealistic presupposition that to be is to be known as being. It may be remarked in passing that if this presupposition is denied, the whole edifice of monistic idealism falls to the ground. We are not now concerned, however, with the question of the existence of the Absolute, but only with its definition. If the presupposition is granted, it is evident that, as Royce maintains, "In order to have the attribute of Omnipotence, a being would necessarily be conceived as essentially world-possessing."¹⁶

The error and suffering and sin of our finite lives are all due to the fragmentariness of our experiences. When taken up into the infinite completeness of the Universal Self, all the imperfections of existence cancel out, or better, all are required to constitute the perfection of the Whole. We, as fragments of the Absolute, may be victims of misfortune, unhappy, discontented, sinful. But the Absolute is perfectly good. Our imperfection, and our thought of the world as imperfect, are the consequence of the limitation of our knowledge. We know in part; the Absolute knows the Whole, and pronounces it complete, and perfectly good.¹⁷

"Misfortune comes to us, and we ask: What means this horror of my fragmentary experience?—why did this happen to me? The question involves the idea of an experience that, if present, would answer the question. Now such an experience, if it were present to us, would be an experience of a certain passing through pain to peace, . . . of a certain far more exceeding weight of glory that would give even this fragmentary horror its place in an experience of triumph and of self-possession. In brief, every time we are weak, downcast, horror-stricken, alone with our sin, the victims of evil fortune or of our own baseness, we stand, as we all know, not only in pres-

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁷ *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, pp. 444 and 449; *Sources of Religious Insight*, p. 224.

ence of agonizing fragmentary experiences, but in presence of besetting problems, which in fact constitute the very heart of our calamity. . . . Well, then, if the divorce of idea and experience characterizes every form of human consciousness of finitude, of weakness, of evil, of sin, of despair, you see that Omnipotence, involving, by definition, the complete and final fulfilment of idea in experience, the unity of thought and act, the illumination of feeling by comprehension, would be an attribute implying, for the being who possessed it, much more than a universally clear but absolutely passionless insight. An Omnipotent Being could answer your bitter *Why?* when you mourn, with an experience that would not simply ignore your passion. For your passion, too, is a fact. It is experienced. The experience of the Omnipotent Being would include it. Only his insight, unlike yours, would comprehend it, and so would answer whatever is rational about your present question. . . . In order to have the attribute of omniscience, a being would necessarily . . . be conceived as omnipotent, and also as in possession of just such experience as ideally ought to be; in other words, as good and perfect."¹⁸

2. *Some Difficulties of Monistic Idealism.*—As has already been remarked, Professor Royce's proof that there *is* such an Absolute Being as he has defined, rests upon the presupposition that all being is *being known*, that all existence is mental. Unless this assumption be granted, the argument goes to pieces. Moreover, in Chapter V we shall meet a consideration, which will make it impossible for us to conceive that the Absolute Self is real. This is the self-contradiction involved in the notion of a "realized infinite." For the present, however, I shall limit myself to pointing out certain other difficulties, which, it seems to me, are inseparable from the conception of the Absolute as it is defined by Royce.

(a) The first of these may be called the *religious* difficulty. We may approach it by considering a conception near akin to that of the monistic Absolute, namely, the conception of

¹⁸ *The Conception of God*, pp. 11 ff.

God as *immanent* in his world. If God is thought of as transcendent, and the supernatural and the natural regarded as mutually exclusive categories, then the friend of religion must view the progress of science with alarm. A division of the world between science and religion, between Nature and God, might be reasonably satisfactory, if one could be sure that the boundary would remain permanently fixed. But, if we define the natural as that which is explicable in terms of scientific law, then, as science extends its territory, and proclaims its belief in the possibility of a universal conquest, the outlook for religion becomes dark indeed. If the supernatural is defined as that which is *not* natural, the scientific view of the world leaves no place for God.

In this perilous situation "liberal" theologians have emphasized the immanence of God, and have said that *all* events are supernatural, since all are produced by, or are particular expressions of, the immanent God. The difficulty of this procedure is, however, that, in thus preserving the right to use the *word* God, we are in danger of so impoverishing the idea of God that it becomes of little value as a religious conception. In order to meet this peril it is then necessary to insist that God is transcendent as well as immanent. Thus to avoid the danger of pantheism, Dr. William Newton Clarke, for example, maintains that "Transcendence is first. . . . It is the transcendence that gives the immanence its meaning. . . . The Christian thought of God is not so much that the immanent God is transcendent, as it is that the transcendent God is immanent."¹⁹ The God who is immanent is the Personal God.

The difficulty, however, is to see how a completely immanent God *can* be personal. Merely to *say* that God is immanent, and that therefore all events are acts of God, and that for this reason the theist need not be troubled by the claim of science to include all events in its realm; and also to *say* that God is transcendent and personal as well as immanent, does not solve

¹⁹ *The Christian Doctrine of God*, p. 322.

the difficulty; any more than to say that a certain geometrical figure is round and also has four right angles will remove the self-contradiction from the notion of a square circle. In the same way, for Royce merely to say that the Absolute is Personal, and that his theory is a theism and not a pantheism does not suffice. Unless we assume that completeness, as opposed to fragmentariness, is *per se* worthy of reverence, an assumption which is by no means self-evident, there seems to be no sufficient reason for worshipping the Absolute;²⁰ and it seems impossible for us to enter into fellowship with such an entity, unless we consciously or unconsciously think of it as if it were a Person distinct from, and standing over against us and all others.

(b) Furthermore, there are certain *psychological* difficulties in the conception of the Absolute. These result from the circumstance that some of our experiences, which are by definition experiences of the Absolute also, are conditioned by our very finiteness, and therefore can not be experienced by an Absolute being. Such experiences are hope and fear, for example. A being who knows perfectly what the morrow will bring forth can not hope for anything on the morrow; neither can he fear. If I am sure of obtaining a certain boon, I do not *hope* to obtain it; still less can I be said to fear lest I shall not obtain it. Both of these emotions presuppose some degree of uncertainty with reference to the future, and such uncertainty is incompatible with omniscience. In the same way it is impossible that an omniscient being should ever experience curiosity or the joy of discovery. The Absolute, too, must be without the experience of sin and repentance. Yet, as Absolute, he must contain all these experiences.

If all we mean when we say that a being is omniscient is that he *knows about* all the experiences of all other beings (in addition to all the other knowledge that he is assumed to possess), then these difficulties do not arise. The Absolute may

²⁰ See Professor Mezes's criticism of Royce's Ultimate Being, *The Conception of God*, pp. 54 ff.

well enough be assumed to know all about my states of mind; but he cannot without contradiction be assumed to include in the totality of his experience the identical hopes and fears and feelings of repentance that I feel.

The same remark must be made of our experience of temporal succession. God, or the Absolute, is said to know all in an *Eternal Now*.²¹ But if that is the nature of his knowledge, it is impossible that He should know things in succession. It must be admitted, however, that both kinds of knowledge are attributed to him. It is common to make a distinction between a holy place in which a real experience of succession is found, and a Holy of Holies in which all "bondage to succession" is overcome. Thus the late Professor Bowne, although he criticizes the absolute idealism of the Hegelian school on the ground that "such a system excludes all movement and progress, and the appearance of movement can only be reckoned a delusion," insists nevertheless that "from the theistic standpoint the infinite must be viewed as possessing an eternal mind so far as itself is concerned." On the other hand, "the infinite must be in time, so far as the world process is concerned."²²

Dr. William Newton Clarke writes in a similar strain: "Succession is essential to the significance of events in time, and if God had no knowledge of it he could not understand events or the history that is composed of them, or the life of his children. He has both kinds of knowledge. He eternally knows all things at once, and is also aware of them as they become realized in time and space; and in the perfect mind there is no inconsistency between these two modes."²³

But does this last clause mean anything more than that contradictions may be tolerated in the case of affirmations concerning the perfect mind, which would be intolerable if the

²¹ *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, p. 441; *The Conception of God*, pp. 59 f.; *The World and the Individual*, II, 138 ff.

²² *Metaphysics*, pp. 486, 240 f.

²³ *The Christian Doctrine of God*, p. 346. Cf. pp. 295 ff.

mind were not perfect? And why this reluctance to subject the perfect mind to the "bondage of succession"? We may say, if we will, that God would be limited by succession; but is he not limited in just the same sense by the law of contradiction and the law of love? The attempt to affirm the reality of both kinds of knowledge in the Divine mind suggests, once more, the attempt to define a plane figure that is both square and circular.

This view can be logically defended in no other way than by a denial of the reality of the experience of time. Says Professor Mezes, interpreting the view of Royce, "Speaking technically, time is no reality; things *seem* past and future, and in a sense, non-existent to us, but in fact they are just as genuinely real as the present is. Is Julius Cæsar dead and turned to clay? No doubt he is. But in reality he is also alive, he is conquering Spain, Gaul, Greece, Egypt. He is leading the Roman legions into Britain, and dominating the envious Senate, just as truly as he is dead and turned to clay—just as truly as you now hear the words I am speaking. Every reality is eternally real; pastness and futurity are merely illusions."²⁴

But if the experience of succession is illusory, what then *is* real? The fact that of two experiences one comes *after* the other is certainly as *real* as anything can be. If the two experiences are cognitive, it may indeed happen that the events to which they refer really occurred in a different order from that in which I have experienced them; or these events may really have been simultaneous; but the experiencings themselves *are* in the order in which they come, and it is meaningless to say that they are *really* in a different order, or that *they* are simultaneous. If the Absolute were merely supposed to *know about* them, he might have knowledge of them both at the same moment, although I experience them one after the other; but if my experiencings are numerically the same as certain experiencings of His, then the *order* in which they occur for me must also be the order in which they occur for Him.

²⁴ Royce, *et al.*, *The Conception of God*, p. 60.

(c) Last and most important of all are the *ethical* difficulties of the conception of the Absolute. If all thoughts are thoughts of God, and all events are acts of God, then our evil desires and purposes are purposes and desires of God, and all our sinful deeds are deeds of God. The antinomy between predestination and the goodness of God, which has troubled traditional and popular theology, thus appears in an aggravated form in the theology of immanence. The logical consequence is a denial of the genuineness of the distinction between good and evil, right and wrong. If the Absolute must be conceived to be "in possession of just such experience as ideally ought to be,"²⁵ then, from the standpoint of the Absolute, there is no reason for wishing that anything should be other than it is; no reason for pronouncing one thing evil and another good.

The fact that the partisans of the monistic Absolute, like believers in the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, have been zealous in good works, and have been strenuous advocates of reform and good haters of iniquity of all sorts, does not alter the fact that the *logical* consequence of their creed is a life of resignation and acquiescence. If the account which monistic idealism gives of the world is true, not only is it logically right for me to endure my private pains and disappointments without grumbling, and to "spiritualize" and "idealize" them, seeing that the Absolute is not unhappy, and the Absolute is not disappointed, and that in spite of these "partial evils" "in the universe as a whole the good triumphs";²⁶ but there is no reason why I should bestir myself to lighten the sorrows of my fellow men, since their sorrows too, just as they are, have their proper place in the eternal felicity of the Absolute and contribute to the perfection of the whole.

It may perhaps be said that, since nothing that we can do can disturb or impair the eternal perfection of the Absolute, we

²⁵ *The Conception of God*, p. 13.

²⁶ *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, pp. 454 f.; *Sources of Religious Insight*, pp. 237, 224.

may still, without lack of logical consistency, and without defect of loyalty to the good of the Whole, attempt to brighten the little corner in which we are placed. But if the present proportion of light and shadow is just the correct one to produce the perfection of the Whole, then, assuming the Whole to remain perfect, in brightening one corner, I should automatically darken some other corner; and there is no sufficient reason for wishing to do *that*. If, on the other hand, it should be said that the precise proportion of light and shade in the universe is a matter of indifference, and that consequently I can seek my own happiness and that of others without necessarily diminishing the felicity of the Absolute or of any sentient being, then we should have to conclude that the doctrine of the Absolute is without any moral significance whatever; for, if my pains and sorrows are *not* necessary to the felicity of the Absolute, the doctrine of the Absolute provides no reason why I should bear them patiently.

The monistic idealist is sure to object at this point that the argument of the last few paragraphs is based upon an inadequate account of Royce's ethical theory. For Professor Royce speaks not only of evils which are to be *endured*, but also, and much more, of evils which are to be *overcome*; and, in his theory, the typical evil is not physical pain, or mere pain of any kind, but rather the bad will of a moral agent.

This objection of the monistic idealist, however, introduces considerations which had better be postponed until we have given an account of the ethical argument for theological finitism.

(*To be continued.*)

BALTIMORE, MD.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE MASTER'S COMFORT AND HOPE. By the Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., Principal of New College, London. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh. Cloth. 240 pages. Price \$1.75 net.

In recent years comparatively few English scholars have given more helpful and important books on religious and theological subjects to the Christian public than the author of this volume. His book on "The Ritschlian Theology" introduced him to American readers fifteen or eighteen years ago, and immediately won for him well-deserved and grateful recognition as an original and unfettered searcher after the truth. Since then his "Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus" (1907), his "Christian Certainty and Modern Perplexity" (1910), and his "Studies of Paul and his Gospel" (1911), have made their appearance, each in succession adding new luster to Dr. Garvie's fame as a thinker of broad and sound scholarship, as a writer with rare equipment for clear and forceful literary expression, and as a warm-hearted and inspiring Christian personality whom none of his readers can doubt as possessing a vital faith in and devotion to our Lord Jesus Christ.

A series of sermons by an author of this type, such as is comprised in the present volume, is sure to be received by thoughtful preachers at least, with even heartier welcome than that which greeted Dr. Garvie's earlier publications. "Among all the forms of service to which God has called me," he tells us in the preface to the book, "I prize preaching most highly, and, therefore, I send forth my first volume of sermons with deeper personal interest than any of the books with which I have hitherto endeavored to render some help to Christian theology." The fact that these sermons, twenty in number, give a theological scholar's closely-connected and thoroughly thought-out exposition of one of the best-known and most highly-prized chapters (John 14) in the New Testament, may well attract many readers of religious books. And the touching information the author gives, that "after the 'call home' of my wife, I for awhile felt myself unable to apply myself to my usual studies, and found a task more fitted to a mind sore distressed in writing out in full these sermons (previously delivered from full outlines), in the hope that what I had learned in suffering might be of value to fellow sufferers"—this information is sure to lend added interest to them.

It goes without saying that discourses on the great chapter of St. John, by so distinguished a writer and preacher, and dealing

with the most profound longings of the human soul and the divine assurances vouchsafed to satisfy those longings, are more than ordinary pulpit deliverances. They discuss the great human questions, met with in the chapter, with sympathetic insight, adequate learning, abounding faith, and tender gratitude to God for the revelation made by His beloved Son, and they do this without blinking any of the perplexing problems which modern doubt has raised with reference to the character and knowledge of Jesus, to his resurrection from the dead, and to his glorification to the right hand of the Father in heaven, as well as with reference to the soundness of the Christian expectation of sharing with Jesus the blessedness and joy of an unending life in an eternal home. It is the "comfort and hope" which the Master's words inspire and sustain, that these sermons carry home to perplexed and sorrowing hearts with a power and a graciousness born of conviction in the life and experience of this illuminating and reassuring preacher of the Gospel. To the vast multitudes of sad and suffering people now living in this war-torn world, the truth emphasized in these sermons, and that truth alone, can bring the needed and longed-for supporting and consoling balm.

A. S. WEBER.

BASIC IDEAS IN RELIGION. By the late Rev. Richard W. Micou, D.D., Professor of Theology and Apologetics at the Theological Seminary in Virginia. The Association Press, New York. 1916. Cloth. 496 pages. Price \$2.50 net.

To many a reader of our day, a book so large in size as this and devoted to the study of apologetic theism, as the subtitle indicates it is, has a rather forbidding aspect. It takes too long for a busy man to read such a multitude of crowded pages, especially when the topics discussed in them are seemingly too remote from what is of practical importance in life, to merit his serious and studious attention! Opinions of this sort are superficial and far astray—as anyone willing to devote the leisure hours of several months to this masterly and comprehensive treatise will discover to his great satisfaction and reward. It will bring him fine mental stimulus, delightful religious uplift, and renewed confidence in the foundation truths which support Christian faith. The Holy Scriptures will speak to him more searchingly and impressively than ever before, poetry and art will afford him deepened satisfaction, history and philosophy will make new disclosures to him, ethics and theology will have a stronger appeal, and even physical science will have a new meaning. Indeed his general mode of looking at the material and the spiritual universe will likely be irradiated with a brightened glory.

The function of apologetic theism in general is the defense of religion against misconception, misrepresentation and denial, a

function this science has had to perform from the day the Gospel began to be preached, because from the first the truth of its claims was assailed. The purpose of Dr. Micou's book in particular is to defend Christianity against the assaults made upon it today. The necessity for this and the importance of it, who can doubt? Skepticism and doubt, in myriad forms, are now assaulting its truths, and doing so with a deadliness of intent never matched before. The theologian and the preacher of the Gospel are popularly supposed to be biased in judgment, incapable of fairness, and seldom qualified to discuss the scientific, the historical, the philosophical, and the critical problems which war against the Gospel. To remove this odium, to disarm this slander, they must, therefore, be able to fortify the claims of Christianity, not by appealing merely to the authority of ancient creeds, to the deliverances of the Church, or even to the statements of the Bible, but rather to what commands recognition as being authoritative in the contemporary thought and life and experience of living men, that is by the testimony in which the various forms of that thought and life and experience come to expression.

To the performance of this great and important purpose of scientific and philosophic defense of Christianity, Dr. Micou has addressed himself in this book, and has brought with him and his simple piety and faith to this task, not only very remarkable native endowments suited to the purpose, but likewise equally remarkable stores of acquisition in theology, in philosophy, in science, in literature, and in art, all of which he musters into the service of what he aims to accomplish and succeeds to achieve. Very few men in our generation, one may venture to say, could have rendered this service to the Church and to Christianity in an equally winsome, persuasive and satisfying form and spirit. For the service of today it leaves very little more to be desired as essential and required upon the questions it discusses, and the conclusions at which it arrives. How helpful one should have found the volume had it fallen into one's hands ten or twenty years ago! How it would have assisted one in making one's pulpit and pastoral ministrations more effective! May one not commend it, therefore, most heartily to theological students and to the younger men in the ministry as worthy of being purchased by them and carefully studied for their personal enrichment and for their fuller equipment in the holy office. A. S. WEBER.

THE BELIEF IN GOD AND IMMORTALITY. By James H. Leuba, Professor of Psychology in Bryn Mawr College. Sherman, French and Company, Boston, Mass. Clott. 340 pages. Price \$2.00 net.

This book furnishes an excellent illustration of the methods pursued by modern psychologists in their search for the facts

which underlie religion and religious beliefs. For them and for their purposes, traditional theories, philosophical speculations, and supernatural revelations are supposedly foreign to the realm of their labors. Whatever significance or value they may have for others, to them they have none, and may, therefore, be promptly dismissed and wholly ignored. In *A Psychological Study of Religion*, an earlier volume published by our author, the public was given the results of Dr. Leuba's investigations as to the origin, the nature, the function and the future of belief in what he calls "personal gods." The present book represents a similar inquiry regarding belief in personal immortality, and furnishes us with the findings of the investigations.

Like ancient Gaul, the area covered by the inquiry "is divided into three parts." The first considers the origins of two radically different conceptions of immortality—the primitive and the modern—and shows, to Dr. Leuba's satisfaction at least, the validity of the latter and the untrustworthiness of the former. The second is described as a statistical study of the belief in God and immortality in the United States. The disclosures made by these statistics would be more interesting were they less prejudicial to the generally held opinion that sound morality and religious piety require belief in God and personal immortality. Dr. Leuba, however, does not view with alarm the displacement of this old conviction, by that which is indicated as prevalent by his statistics. To regard his conclusion as destructive, he argues, would be to overlook the three-fold good which is its consequent: (1) The deliverance of man from a devitalizing fear of imaginary consequences that are to attend the loss of these beliefs. (2) His inspiration with renewed confidence in the reliability of the forces by which he feels himself urged onward, however ignorant of their nature he may otherwise be. (3) His enrichment with information useful for the wise guidance of his efforts at reconstruction when reconstruction shall have appeared imperative. The third presents certain facts and considerations bearing upon the present utility of the beliefs in God and personal immortality, from which it appears to our psychologist that the enormous practical importance hitherto ascribed to these beliefs no longer corresponds to the reality. What the real losses, entailed by the surrender of them, would be, and what compensations or possible gains would result, make up the final pages of this volume, the criticism of which may be safely left to its readers.

A. S. WEBER.

THE VALIDITY OF THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By George A. Barrow, Ph.D. Sherman, French & Co., Boston, Mass. Cloth. 250 pages. Price \$1.50 net.

There is something delightfully refreshing and reassuring in every one of the seven lectures which make up the contents of this volume. The lectures were recently delivered at Harvard University, and are now, at the instance of those that heard them, made available to a new and wider circle interested in the important subject which they so ably discuss. Not only can God be known, according to Dr. Barrow, but the personal experience men have of Him is the natural and the reliable way of acquiring a knowledge of Him. Hence, the need and importance of an analytic and definitive study of these experiences which are distinct from all other experiences, and provide, therefore, the material for the science of theology, as well as for a philosophy of religion. In the concluding lecture, the author defines the province of theological science and contends for the recognition of the philosophy of Christianity, both together ministering most effectively not only to a revival of interest in theology, but also to a renewed interest in personal religion itself. Since the appearance of the late Dr. Stearns' famous volume on *The Evidence of Christian Experience*, twenty-five or thirty years ago, no book on this general subject has been published that better deserves careful reading than the one here under notice.

A. S. WEBER.

FOUNDATIONS—A STATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN BELIEF IN TERMS OF MODERN THOUGHT. By Seven Oxford Men. Macmillan and Company, New York. Cloth. 640 pages. Price \$4.00 net.

The title and the authorship of this voluminous publication will pleasantly remind many a reader, if he is old enough, of two other books the appearance of which at the time caused not a little stir in the religious world. Balfour's *Foundations of Belief* is recalled because of the similarity of its title with that of this volume, and also because much that it sought to do for its day is undertaken by its namesake in the service of our times. "Lux Mundi" is recalled because, like this new book, it is the work of collaborating English university men, who, whilst able to speak with competent learning and recognized authority only upon particular theological topics, essay to render a larger service by a joint-effort in making a careful reëxamination, and, so far as necessary, a careful restatement, of the foundations of Christian belief in the light of the knowledge of the present day.

All of these men recognize the fact that such reëxamination and restatement are essential at once for the maintenance of the present status and for the further progress of Christianity. It and its traditional theology have come down to us from an age very

different from our own, an age when the sun and the stars moved round the earth, when the meaning of natural law and of evolution was only dimly apprehended, when the psychology of religion, the historical method and the critical study of ancient documents, were yet unborn. These things touch the foundations on which the old beliefs have rested, and so far as that theology is out of harmony with the established discoveries of science, philosophy and sound scholarship men will refuse to accept it, even though they cry for a religion to satisfy at the same time their mind and heart, a thing which neither obscurantism nor rationalism can do.

There is no room here to do more than to indicate thus imperfectly the aim these Oxford men have set for themselves. Their respective contributions are not of equal value, but taken together they will serve to awaken a new and deepened interest in the various phases of truth that are examined. And were it not for the general preoccupation of thinking men by the world-war, the stir the book would cause would be quite as deep and interesting as that caused by the two books which I have above referred to. The REVIEW begs to commend this volume to its readers.

A. S. WEBER.

THE NEW ARCHEOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES AND THEIR BEARING UPON THE NEW TESTAMENT AND UPON THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.
By Camden M. Cobern, D.D., Litt.D. Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York and London.

As the author says in the preface, "This book has no competitor, for it is a pioneer in this field."

"Specialists have written many ponderous volumes touching limited areas of the general subject, but no one has previously attempted to give a summary of all the discoveries of all lands, so far as these in any important way have cast light upon the New Testament writings or the life of the Primitive Church."

By giving us such a summary the author has put all New Testament students under a permanent debt of gratitude. He has gathered a vast amount of material that is interesting and helpful to every reader of the New Testament; and he has told his story in an interesting and popular manner. Though he tells of the rubbish heaps of Egypt, Asia Minor and Italy, there is not a dry or uninteresting page in the entire volume.

Part One treats of the "Greek Papyri and other Manuscripts"; and these are studied with especial reference to their bearing on the New Testament writings. The description of the modern discoveries of papyri in Egypt, and especially in the Fayum, reads like a romance. Telling of the amazing find of Grenfell and Hunt in the ancient Tebtunis, the author relates this exceedingly interesting and amusing story. "They had been digging

here for papyri, but for many weeks they found nothing but crocodiles. Crocodiles are no good substitute for papyri. When Dr. Petrie a few years before had found a cemetery of sacred crocodiles near Hawara, there had been some curiosity and pleasure in such a novel discovery; but one such cemetery is surely enough and the diggers at Tebtunis were thoroughly disgusted, when day after day crocodiles and nothing but crocodiles appeared. Finally one workman was so overcome with stupid anger at his disappointment in finding a baby crocodile in a tomb which he had hoped might contain a princess robed in jewels, that he flung the mummy of this crocodile upon a rock and broke it to pieces—and then the discovery was made! The crocodile was stuffed with papyri!" And then there was a rush for the other mummies of these sacred animals; and many of them were literally stuffed and wrapped in these ancient documents—many of them written, while Jesus preached in Galilee, on the same kind of paper and in the same kind of Greek that our Gospels were written. When the finds, thus made, were sent to England, the boxes, in which they were packed, weighed, not pounds, but tons! And what is more, the author points out the great value of these discoveries for New Testament study.

Part Two of this interesting volume treats of monuments, inscriptions, and other remains; and these are studied with especial reference to their bearing on the life and times of the primitive Church. The author points out the new light thrown upon primitive Church history by graves and buried cities. Then he describes the recent excavations at Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, Rome, and the cities in which the Galatian Churches were located. In fact, he gives sidelights from nearly all the cities visited by Saint Paul. Finally the book deals with new documentary and other evidences throwing light upon the early Christian centuries.

We run no risk in saying that all ministers of the Gospel and all Sunday-School teachers will find in this volume a rich store of valuable and interesting information. We know of no book which gives so much information on the new archeological discoveries in their bearing on the New Testament. Many a sermon may be brightened up with new and interesting illustrations from these pages. We heartily recommend the book to all students and lovers of the New Testament.

WM. C. SCHAEFFER.

FRANKLIN SPENCER SPALDING, MAN AND BISHOP. By John Howard Melish. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1917. Price \$2.25.

This is the life of a religious pioneer. Pioneers are generally written up and appreciated in the next generation; they are not apt to receive much notice in their own. They are pioneers

because they see something before others, feel a need and an opportunity before the rest, so, if they have the necessary courage and will power, they press on to meet it. Franklin Spencer Spalding was essentially a pioneer and a religious pioneer, so his life has interest and value far outside the ranks of the communion of which he was a distinguished member.

"Man and Bishop" is the sub-title of this biography. Dr. Melish, who is the rector of Holy Trinity Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., and who is himself known for fearless leadership and multiplied service in the most congested center of life in this western world, writes the life of a missionary bishop in the vast and scattered West. For, as of old, perhaps it is still true, out of the West shall come those that shall rule this people. Spalding was a man before he was a Bishop, and a truer Bishop because of that. He was brought up in the West, his father, John Franklin Spalding, being the Bishop of Colorado. No man ever looked less or acted less like a Bishop than Franklin Spencer Spalding, and no one was more respected by his fellows as one, although he called himself a Socialist. His mother was originally a Presbyterian; his cousins, with whom he corresponded much, being unmarried, were staunch Presbyterians and so his Church loyalty was tempered by a wide charity. He held both strongly in exquisite balance.

At Princeton where he graduated in 1887, he played on the football team, and was one of the editors of the *Princetonian* as well. He was called the best-known and best-loved man in his class; in fact, his college nickname was "Old Pop," short for "Old Popularity." He left college a clean, simple, virile, modest Christian man, hating sham or pretence in every guise. Indeed, this was the keynote of his career, and this was perhaps why, at the General Theological Seminary, he could not abide Ritual for ritual's sake. This is again why, at Erie, where he was called to his father's old parish, in building a Parish House and in coming into intimate contact with the lives of the plain people, the contrast with the mental outlook of his rich parishioners started him on the road to Socialism. He read at it fiercely, as was his wont, in order to find the key to the riddle of modern maladjustment and the remedy, and in Engel's *Manifesto* he found it. It was his habit to tease sober and respectable church bookstores by asking them if he could purchase it there, and when told there was "no demand" for it, he delighted in informing them how many hundred a month were disposed of down the street at the Socialist headquarters.

As Bishop of Utah, the railroads withdrew his passes because of his economic stand; but Frank Spalding was made of the prophets' stuff, and he never faltered in his stand. Neither did

he neglect the work of the ministry and the Gospel. He preached in the big rich churches of the East, raising money for his struggling missions in the West. He read conscientiously all the Mormon literature, and with the help of Egyptian scholars all over the world, to whom he submitted the question, he published what the Mormons themselves recognized was the one fair and forceful criticism of their "Book of Abraham."

Dr. Melish has given us a typically American biography, succinct, direct, without overelaboration or adulation—a clean-cut picture of a full-sized western man and officer in the church and army of God, moreover religious pioneer. Bishop Spalding would have had no part or lot with the present unpatriotic stand of one section of the Socialist Party in this country. He was a modest as well as a courageous soul. Some one has said the "Sobs of Hosea lay behind the renunciation of Amos." He lectured everywhere on Socialism, whenever invited. He never preached on it from his pulpit except on the great occasion of his historic sermon at the General Convention of 1913 in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York. There, before the assembled bishops and picked leaders of his church, clerical and lay, he spoke his full mind to the uttermost. He proclaimed the faith that was in him, closing with the triumphant words, "The Church must cease to be the almoner of the rich and become the champion of the poor." Tremblingly he went into the pulpit, saying to a friend immediately beforehand, "I would rather be whipped than do it, but do it I must." "Who," says Dr. Melish, "that was present can ever forget the sight of his tall spare figure in the pulpit and the consecration of the man? The zeal of a great cause consumed him, the Word of God burned like fire in his bones as in Jeremiah's, and made his every utterance a lambent and searching flame. The storms of the Rockies were in that appeal, their lightnings and crashes of thunder in those incisive words. It was one of the most dramatic scenes ever witnessed in an American Church."

At London when the Pan-Anglican and Lambeth Conferences met in 1908, he had spoken his mind on Socialism as a scientific, not a Utopian, Socialist, and when he preached in Westminster Abbey, the Americans present were proud of their race and their nation; in fact this was one of the few sermons preached by American Bishops published by the *Church Times*, although his type of churchmanship differed from theirs.

Moreover Bishop Spalding was a "Man." The letters to his mother of this American grown-up boy are precious documents of human value, to testify to the depth and dignity of our western life. We need no old-world classics, we have our own. But as a Pioneer, keen, studious, modest, yet fearless and eager,

Frank Spalding's career as the first American Socialist Bishop has a value which perhaps the next generation will appreciate better than we of this. The thinking man of consecrated patriotism, even in these days of wars, can gain both pleasure and inspiration from its perusal. "He was the manliest, most godly, knightly soul whom I have ever met," said Bishop Rowe, of Alaska. He belongs to American Christianity as well as to his own church. I, who wrote this, can never, and will never, forget one afternoon's walk and talk with him on Socialism. Life seemed one eager battlefield for God and man. God grant that we may all catch something of his spirit, that we may carry on his work, and stand for his cause in some measure as he did!

"Of heroic mold, with a spirit brave and gentle; clean cut in his thinking, and forceful in his speech; with a heart that beat in sympathy with all who suffered; with the vision of an economic and spiritual order wherein the wage earners are to be masters of nature and brothers of men, possessing all they produce, Franklin Spencer Spalding lived in his time and place, a man among men and a bishop such as we shall not soon see the like again." The volume is warmly recommended, as one of the most readable books of the year, the story of a hero and helper of humanity.

GEORGE ISRAEL BROWNE.

THE BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH, THEIR ORIGIN, CONTENTS AND SIGNIFICANCE (BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION SERIES). By Frederick Carl Eiselen, Professor of Old Testament Interpretation in Garrett Biblical Institute, The Methodist Book Concern, New York. 1916. Pages 1-351. Price \$1.50.

From the preface to the volume under consideration we learn that this is the first in a series of four volumes devoted to the Old Testament. The subject-matter of the present volume is presented in nineteen chapters. The first three are of a general character, treating of the scope and history of Old Testament Introduction, the books of the Pentateuch and their contents, and the history of Pentateuchal criticism; the four following present the arguments in support of the Mosaic authorship and a criticism of these arguments; the next five discuss the arguments in support of the non-Mosaic and composite authorship; the three following discuss the question of the chronological order of the documents; the next two are devoted to a discussion of the ancient material embodied in the documents; the next traces the gradual growth of the Pentateuch; and the last presents an estimate of the value of the Pentateuch, judged both from a historical and from a religious standpoint. There is also an index consisting of two parts: Subjects Discussed; and Biblical Passages.

As is well known, the subject of the present volume has been treated again and again, notably by German scholars, but also by others, or, as our author phrases it, "even by English-speaking scholars." Thus, for example, there are excellent treatises on this subject in German, French, Dutch and English. What then, one naturally asks, is the *raison d'être* of the present publication? The author gives an answer to this question in the preface. He says that the present volume was published because he had the feeling that Old Testament scholars hitherto, in treating this subject, addressed themselves too exclusively to the technically trained student of the Old Testament and not sufficiently to the technically untrained great multitude of those who are nevertheless also interested in the Old Testament and which, as a consequence, Old Testament scholarship has thus failed to reach hitherto. A paragraph from the preface, bearing on this point, may here be quoted: "To some it may appear presumptuous on the part of the author to offer to Bible students a new Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. The ground has been covered often, even by English-speaking scholars, and, what is far more significant, has been covered well. To mention but a few books in English: the student with adequate preparation may turn to the standard work by the late Professor Driver, or to the admirable Introduction of Professor Cornill; the student interested in a more popular presentation of the subject will find satisfactory guides in the Introductions of Professors Bennett, McFadyen, and G. B. Gray. And yet the author has felt for some time that there is room for another Introduction—an Introduction as complete, comprehensive, and scholarly as the works of Driver and Cornill, but written in less technical or more popular language and style."

From the foregoing it is clear that the avowed aim and purpose of our author was to produce what is variously designated in different countries a *Volksbuch*, *un livre de vulgarisation*, or a popular work. Popular works on this subject in German are: Merx, *Die Bücher Moses und Josua*; and Hühn, *Die Fünf Bücher Moses und das Buch Josua (Der Hexateuch)*. In French we have the following: Gautier, *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*. These are only named as the most outstanding examples. As to the popular works on this subject in English, the reader has already been informed, in the preceding paragraph quoted from the preface of the work under consideration.

To write a popular and satisfactory work on this subject is not an easy task, but in our judgment the author has on the whole succeeded admirably. The book is a very readable one. An inaccuracy in detail is the use of the word *Jehovistic* as a synonym of *Yahwistic*.

The book may be commended to Sunday-School superintendents and teachers, to Bible students generally, who desire to acquaint themselves with the general results of modern literary or higher criticism of the first five books of the Old Testament. Ministers too, who desire a treatise in English less technical and more popular in style and language than the works by Driver and Cornill, make no mistake, in our judgment, if they secure a copy of this very readable work. Those students of the Old Testament who desire a "zünftige Einleitung," later than the works by Driver and Cornill and also more voluminous, an Introduction that will keep them more nearly au courant with the progress of research, will of course turn to Steuernagel, *Einleitung in das alte Testament*.

IRWIN HOCH DELONG.

STUDIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By Joseph Bryant Rotherham. The Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati. Price \$1.00.

The author is particular to tell us in his preface, "The following are, strictly speaking, 'Studies,' not a continuous commentary." The book hence does not make any pretense to being a full or exhaustive exposition.

The volume contains first of all a new and original translation. This is given in sections, each section being followed by a study, or by expository comments. This translation is throughout quite literal, the author's aim apparently being to reproduce the original forms of expression as nearly as possible. The result is that the English idiom is constantly sacrificed for the sake of preserving the forms of expression used in the original. Occasionally a text is illumined thereby; but it is also, at least at times, obscured. In no case is this translation adapted for the public reading of the Epistle, and scarcely for comfortable private study. While the student, who is able to use the Greek New Testament, will, no doubt, find much that is suggestive, the ordinary reader will often be perplexed and even confused.

The exposition has many excellencies; and it is generally clear and often very clever. This is especially true of what may be called the study of words and phrases. Thus the note on "soul and spirit" in 4:12 is excellent and quite suggestive. On the other hand, the treatment of the crucial passages is often disappointing. As an example, we may point to 9:13, 14. These two verses, without much question, contain the most important statement on the high priestly ministry of Jesus; in fact, the whole argument on the high priesthood here reaches its climax. Yet, when one turns to the author's comments, he finds the passage disposed of in one brief paragraph, which the ordinary reader is apt to pass over without a suspicion that he is here face to face with the beating heart of the entire Epistle.

We can hence hardly endorse the announcement with which the publishers send out the book. They call it "an expository masterpiece." While that may be clever advertising, it is scarcely a fair characterization of the book. To one who has been accustomed to study the Epistle to the Hebrews with the help of such masterpieces as Westcott, Bruce, Marcus Dods, or VonSoden, or even the shorter works of Peake and Davidson, the book is disappointing. Without questioning the author's scholarship, or his skill in explaining isolated passages, we think he has failed in setting forth the argument as a whole in such a clear and convincing manner that the ordinary reader will grasp the main purpose and thought of the Epistle.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

THE SOUL OF A BISHOP. By H. G. Wells. The Macmillan Co. Cloth. 341 pages. Price \$1.50 net.

The book is an argument in fiction for the elimination of kings, nations, creeds, religious denominations, and a separate clergy. This will hasten the establishment of a great world republic with God as king.

The Bishop of Princhester, a man given to the excessive use of wine and Egyptian cigarettes, learns first that the Church is not a social nor economic force. She is commanded to stand aside while the struggle between labor and capital goes on.

At the outbreak of the war he realizes that the Church is really one of the institutions which separate mankind into groups and make conflict possible. His conscience is no longer at ease. His parish work is heavy and he finally finds himself afflicted with insomnia. Dr. Dale gives him a peculiar drug which throws him into a state of semi-consciousness. While in this state he has a vision of God. He sees God as Righteousness and Truth and becomes aware of his immanence. In a second vision he sees the world in conflict while the heart of man is yearning for unity and brotherhood. He realizes that this conflict is caused by the many divisions of mankind. The great dividing factors are political nations, religious creeds, and special religious teachers. He confides in Lady Sunderbund, who believes in him and is willing to follow him.

He breaks with the Church and moves to London. Here he finds the Church owning property and charging exorbitant rents. This confirms his own faith. Lady Sunderbund offers to erect a chapel for him. This at first appeals to him but upon more mature thought he realizes that in this way he would increase rather than decrease the divisions of man. God can not be made real to mankind through the Church. Religion is experimental.

Everybody must meet God as he met him. We can not know God absolutely. He can not be transmitted by means of religious formulas. God desires him to spend the remainder of his life in a humanitarian way. Eleanor accepts her father's views. So do the rest of his family, but Miriam asks: "Can we still be christians?"

The book is well worth reading. The author is unfair to the clergy. The bishop of Princhester is not a fair type. He overestimates the stress the Church lays upon the ancient creeds. He underestimates the value of worship, in fact he has no place for it. While he rails against the Church he seeks much in common with the Church. The Church too looks for a brotherhood not bounded by national lines. So she looks for religious unity in which righteousness and love shall be the abiding bond. Much progress has been made along these lines in the last half century.

The author too has a creed, and what is more remarkable is the fact that he might preach it in almost any church I know and not be found a heretic. I have reference only to his view of God which may be summed up as follows: God is righteousness; God is truth; God is immanent. And to his view of the world as one great brotherhood whose king is God. And to his view of religion as a personal experience which can not be transmitted by means of religious formulas.

LAWRENCE E. BAIR.

SIX FOOLS. By Rollo Franklin Hurlburt. Published by The Methodist Book Concern, New York City. 1916. Cloth. Pages 284. Price \$1.25.

Under the title *Six Fools* Mr. Hurlburt presents six very interesting subjects relating to modern life. Moral, social, economic and political life is portrayed in a very clear and attractive manner. All of these, however, relate themselves to the religious expression that the author maintains should and must be developed through the acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior and the Bible as the standard of excellence. The author shows some very simple but effective psychological and sociological truths. Statistics throughout the book are quite emphatic in proving the points discussed. Literary quotations used at the opening of every chapter seem very appropriate and are well chosen.

The book is divided into six divisions: The Young Fool, The Companion Fool, The Woman Fool, The Rich Fool, The King Fool, The No-God Fool. The word "fool" is used in its Biblical sense—evil persons, boasters, self-confident persons, empty fellows, thickheaded, thoughtless, unwise, and rebellious creatures.

A copy of this book may find its rightful place on the shelf of any active pastor's library, for ready reference. Much of the material lends itself to good use in preparing a series of sermons on "Fools." Sunday-School teachers and leaders of Young People's Societies will find this an excellent book for supplementary reading and study. On the whole the book commends itself for the moral and spiritual values, helpful to every serious reader.

W. D. MARBURGER.

THE LIGHT OF PARNELL. By John W. Appel. The Heidelberg Press, Philadelphia, 1916. Pages 395.

The readers of this REVIEW will be especially interested in this charming historical romance from the pen of John W. Appel, Esq. The author is the son of one of the leaders of the Reformed Church of the past generation, and he has become one of her most representative laymen. He holds important positions in her councils, and not infrequently he wields his voice and pen in the interest of her institutions. His many friends and acquaintances have long esteemed him for the breadth of his mental horizon and for the depth of his knowledge; they have honored him for his solid achievements in his chosen profession and for his intelligent and constant devotion to the church. But we venture the assertion that the publication of this book was a surprise to many, for it reveals the author as one in whose full-orbed life there are interests other than the professional, and more deeply human than the purely intellectual. In *The Light of Parnell*, Mr. Appel is more than a lawyer, more than a churchman, more than a student of human affairs. He is an interpreter of life.

And the author gives abundant proof in the pages of his delightful book that he really understands life. He has not merely observed it from afar, as a curious spectator or as a dispassionate critic, but he has entered into its ebb and flow with keen zest,—like a robust swimmer, feeling its exhilaration and mastering its currents. Hence the book is not a prosaic and pedantic dissertation on life, but a vivid transcript of some of its phases, in which the creative imagination and the artistic skill of the author have woven historical facts and personal experiences into a fascinating tapestry. That explains the varied interest and the dramatic quality of the book. It has the variety of life itself, and also its unfailing charm. Its characters are familiar types, and their experiences do not strain one's power of credence.

Most historical romances fail at one or both of these points. Their leading figures lack psychological unity and veracity, and their main episodes are more like feats of magic than like narra-

tives of fact. Mr. Appel's tale is shot through with the glamour of romance. It is a fine story of a man and a maid, whose course of true love encountered many difficulties and was tested and tried in diverse manners. But the stirring adventures of Tom Webster and Rose Sheldon never transport us into the realm of pure fancy. They interest us because their life and love are so firmly anchored in the soil of our common humanity. And the psychological analysis of the various characters of the romance is equally true to life. The author is at home in the outer courts of life, where men do and dare, and in its inner sanctuary where the hidden springs of conduct are found. Thus, as the episodes of the book are credible, so its main characters are plausible.

That note of reality constitutes one of the marked characteristics of the book. It is not difficult for a romancer to spin impossible or improbable yarns, but it is far from easy for a writer to invest real life with the halo of romance. Mr. Appel has accomplished this task in a very satisfactory manner. The reader of his romance finds himself transported into southern Pennsylvania during the time of the Civil War. That dark and blood-stained chapter of our history is graphically and truthfully depicted. But the story is not a mere chronicle of bivouac and battle. The author makes us realize that this, too, was a war of ideals, the clash of two types of civilization. It was not merely slavery that was at stake, but democracy itself. And thus the bitter passion, the bloody strife, and the stupendous sacrifice of those days are set in a light that transfigures them.

That is the *real* light of Parnell. The title of the book, *The Light of Parnell*, refers to the beacon kindled nightly by its heroine, Rose Sheldon, to guide runaway slaves to a place of shelter and safety on Mt. Parnell, the famous peak of the beautiful Blue Mountains, near Mercersburg. But that beacon merely symbolizes the light that illuminated the soul of Rose Sheldon, the mystic flame of human brotherhood. That forms the Leitmotif of the romance, from its troubled prelude, which describes John Brown's disastrous raid, to its happy ending, after Gettysburg, in the marriage of Rose Sheldon and Tom Webster.

Woven into the fabric of the story, the reader will find a genuine appreciation of nature in all her variant moods, and delicious bits of humor. And an inner circle of readers, familiar with the early history of the educational institutions of the Reformed Church, will derive special pleasure from the author's frequent allusions to that small group of distinguished scholars who made Mercersburg famous in those days, and among whom was his father. The style of the book is excellent, and the Heidelberg Press has given it an attractive dress.

The reviewer takes special pleasure in recommending Mr. Appel's volume warmly to all who appreciate a love-story that is pure, a romance that is real, and an interpretation of an important period of American history that is idealistic to the core. He recommends it especially to the readers of this REVIEW as the best historical romance that has been written recently by a member of the Reformed Church.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

380

